

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 5, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery a distinguished visitor in the person of the Netherlands Ambassador to Australia, His Excellency Mr. T. Elink Schuurman. I am sure it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that His Excellency be given a seat on the floor of the House. I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition if they will introduce His Excellency.

His Excellency Mr. Schuurman was escorted by the Hon. Frank Walsh and the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS

BEDFORD PARK UNIVERSITY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Australian Universities Commission recommended that £200,000 be made available to the South Australian Government this year as part of the cost of halls of residence to be erected at the Bedford Park university site. Can the Premier say whether the State Government has rejected or accepted the offer of the Commonwealth Government in this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Certain negotiations are proceeding with Senator Gorton, the Commonwealth Minister in charge of education matters. The Commonwealth Government intimated that it would make money available to the State Government for certain other buildings at Bedford Park, but it has been informed that, because we are unable to make a matching grant available this year, certain buildings cannot proceed until the position is reviewed next year. I am not certain which buildings are involved, but I shall obtain a report. We are awaiting further information from the Commonwealth Government regarding the halls of residence.

KETCH MISHAP.

Mr. RYAN: Last week the ketch *Nelcebee* was involved in an unfortunate mishap off West Beach, as a result of which the crew abandoned the vessel. Normally trading between Port Adelaide and various outports, including those on Kangaroo Island, the vessel was taken into tow. It was subsequently reported that a marine inquiry would be held and that a skin diver, engaged to examine the

hull of the vessel after it had been unloaded, found nothing at all wrong with it. Will the Minister of Marine say whether an inquiry into this mishap is to be held?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It would be improper for me to comment on this matter, other than to say that the Harbors Board has decided that a preliminary inquiry shall be held forthwith.

CROPS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the condition of crops in the country, consequential on the prolonged dry weather?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Following the honourable member's question, I have had a report prepared by Mr. Pearson who, I am pleased to say, is recovering from a serious illness. We are indeed happy to know that he is back at work. His report states:

Following useful to good rains early in September, the weather has been warm to hot since then, with little or no useful rain. Some windy days dried out crops and pastures to some extent, and did some limited localized damage. Hail in the Buckleboo district seriously damaged about 2,000 acres of crops. Crops developed rapidly on the early rains and the first warm weather. Continuing warm, dry conditions have caused some thinning out and a deterioration of wheat, oat and barley crops, and are starting to affect peas and linseed. Throughout the season, subsoil moisture has been lacking and, now with the longer days and rising temperatures, crops generally will continue to deteriorate fairly rapidly in the absence of good soaking rains and cooler weather. Barley grub and various diseases are reducing potential yields to some extent in the dry conditions.

Pastures have matured fairly quickly, and, while they will provide sufficient grazing for stock in most if not all districts, bulk is lacking and below average quantities of pasture hay and ensilage will be made. In the lower rainfall areas barley grass has gone to seed and is causing some trouble. Annual clovers are not seeding down very well, and seed for both autumn grazing and next year's pasture development could be light. Lucerne, particularly in the Murray Mallee, responded well to the early September rains, and warm weather, and is providing valuable grazing. With a good soaking rain in the next week or so cereal yields will be about average in most districts, except Upper Eyre Peninsula and the northern Murray Mallee districts, where crops have already deteriorated noticeably. In the absence of good rains and cool weather cereal crops in all districts will deteriorate fairly quickly. Pastures, particularly in the moderate to good rainfall districts, can develop usefully with reasonable to good rains soon, but will deteriorate rapidly in the absence of rain. In the lower rainfall districts only

limited recovery can now be expected from any further rains.

STUDENTS' ALLOWANCES.

Mr. HUDSON: During the debate on the Estimates I asked the Minister of Education how many additional teacher trainees were provided for in the increased vote for allowances for students in training. Has the Minister that information?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The amount estimated for allowances for students in training for 1965-66 of £1,365,900 provides for allowances for 3,008 departmental students who will be in college from July 1 to December 31, 1965, and for 3,350 students who will be in college from January 1 to June 30, 1966. The anticipated intake into college in February, 1966, is 1,305 compared with the 1965 intake of 1,112.

WARREN RETICULATION SYSTEM.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: During the Loan Estimates debate I drew the attention of honourable members to a proposal contained in Sir Thomas Playford's policy speech in March last, in which he stated that if he were returned to power a main would be constructed from Swan Reach to link up with the Warren reticulation system. I pointed out in my speech that such a main would also indirectly be able to serve the metropolitan area, as it would no longer be necessary then for water from the Mannum-Adelaide main to be pumped into the Warren reservoir, and that such a main would also serve the rapidly growing country areas now being served by the Warren system. Will the Minister of Works say whether this matter has been considered and, if it has, will he get a report on it?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Preliminary surveys of the Swan Reach to Stockwell main have been completed, the permanent location survey is in hand, and preliminary design has been commenced. When the survey and design are sufficiently far advanced, estimates of cost will be prepared and details of the scheme submitted for investigation by the Public Works Committee. No finance is available from the current financial year's Loan Fund to commence construction on this project but all the above essential engineering work is being undertaken as quickly as possible so that, in the event of a favourable report by the Public Works Committee and subsequent Cabinet approval being given, construction work could commence during next financial year.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 23 regarding standardization of the railway line between Port Pirie and Adelaide?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Preliminary investigations have been and are being made into the project for the possible standardization of the rail link between Adelaide and Port Pirie, and conferences have been held on the subject between the Department of the Minister of Transport and the Commonwealth Railways Department. The Commonwealth Railways Commissioner is expected to report to his Minister on this project, but I am unable to say when he will be able to do so.

Mr. HEASLIP: The line from Port Pirie to Adelaide at present passes through Wandearah to Merriton and thence to Adelaide. A suggested alternative was that it should go back to Crystal Brook, and thence to Merriton. Another alternative was that it should go to Crystal Brook and down to Red Hill. Will the Premier, when the investigations are made, consider these alternative routes?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no doubt that the Railways Commissioner has considered these matters in any discussions he has had with the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner. If it is possible to get further information from my colleague, I am prepared to do so.

VALUERS.

Mr. SHANNON: For some years various groups of people have been interested in the land valuation problem arising from various authorities being charged with the function of valuing land for different purposes. The New South Wales Government has set up a Royal Commission on land valuation and rating systems, and I understand that the Commission is to start taking evidence today. A report I have indicates that at a preliminary hearing of the Commission on September 6 the Chairman (Mr. Justice Else-Mitchell) said that the Commission would concentrate on broad issues affecting the whole State and would avoid local issues and local grievances. This appears to me to be a forward move in overcoming what is a serious problem for many people who have to deal with the various valuers set up under our Acts of Parliament. One overall authority responsible in this field would simplify many aspects. Will the Premier consult Cabinet with a view to deciding whether such a move might not be desirable in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already discussed with an officer of my department the licensing of appraisers. It has been the practice over many years to issue licences to people about whom there would be some doubt whether they were the appropriate valuing authority. Another question concerns the suggested appointment of a Valuer-General for the whole State. At present there are valuers in the Lands Department and in the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Shannon: And every local government body has one.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, and possibly the less we say about valuers in local government bodies the better. The whole matter of valuers is to receive further attention, particularly in the departments over which I have jurisdiction, so that we can evolve a better system.

UNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently the Unley Girls Technical High School vacated the area previously held jointly by that school and the Unley Primary School with great benefit to both schools. One prefabricated classroom has been removed from the site but many still remain. Will the Minister of Education expedite the removal of buildings not required there with a view to helping establish better playing fields for the Unley Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to take up that matter.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Since we last sat, my attention has been drawn by someone outside the House to a disparity between the list of Parliamentary Papers on our Notice Paper and that on the Notice Paper of the Legislative Council. Some weeks ago, following complaints as to the method adopted by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, it was decided to mark with an asterisk papers about which no recommendation for disallowance was to be made. If one compares the lists in the two Houses, one finds a complete disparity between them. For example, at present only two papers on our Notice Paper do not carry an asterisk, whereas on the Legislative Council Notice Paper there are several dozen, 12 being the same as those that have an asterisk against them on this House's list. In other words, it seems that the Subordinate Legislation Committee has split its personality and is doing one thing in the House of Assembly and another in the Legislative Council. I ask the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), as

Chairman of this committee, what is the reason for this disparity?

The SPEAKER: I shall not allow that question to the honourable member for Port Pirie. It is not a matter for him: it is a matter between the committee and the Clerks who prepare the Notice Paper. I assure the honourable member that our Notice Paper is correct.

MORPHETT VALE SCHOOL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Education an answer to my recent question about the primary school at Morphett Vale?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Crown Solicitor, acting on behalf of the Education Department, is compulsorily acquiring 10 acres of part section 562, hundred of Noarlunga, as a site for this school. Although ownership of the site has not yet been obtained, the stage has been reached where there is no obstacle to the Education Department entering into possession of the land whenever it so desires. The present planning of the department has February, 1968, as the target date for the opening of this school. The old primary school will stay after the new school is occupied, but the ultimate plan is to establish a new school at a site to be purchased at Hackham. When the school at Hackham is built, the old school at Morphett Vale will probably not be required, and if not, will then be disposed of by the department. The road-widening programme will require land from the old school grounds, but the extent of the requirement is not yet known.

TOD RIVER RESERVOIR.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I refer to the quality of water in the Tod River reservoir and the Tod River trunk main. Tests made last weekend indicate that the salinity of this water is about 150 grains. That is not seriously high for older stock, but it is high for younger stock, which find it distasteful, and it is of little use for gardening and bowling greens. In the past the Engineer-in-Chief has arranged for more water from the Uley Basin to be pumped into the storage tank at the Tod River reservoir, and for a mixture of reservoir and Uley water to be supplied to the trunk main. Will the Minister of Works ask the Engineer-in-Chief whether steps can be taken to keep the salinity of this water within reasonable limits, say, between 100 and 120 grains?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter

to my notice, and I will check with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether relief can be given.

MOUNT GAMBIER SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: Some time ago £40,000 was provided by the Education Department to construct a boys' craft room at the Mount Gambier Technical High School. I understood that tenders for this work were to close about the middle of September. Can the Minister of Education say whether this is so, and, if it is, whether a tender has been accepted and when work is likely to commence on this project?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member.

STRIKES.

Mr. COUMBE: On August 10 last I asked the Premier a question in relation to statutory declarations which the Chief Inspector of Factories has to receive under the Industrial Code, regarding strikes that had been occurring in the building industry at that time. The Premier replied that four such declarations had been received, and went on to say that, in accordance with previous practice, they had been referred to the Crown Solicitor with the request that, if he considered that there were grounds for suspecting that a strike was taking place, he prepare the necessary informations (which the Chief Inspector is required to lay before the President of the Industrial Court).

As a consequence of that reply, will the Premier now say, first, whether the statutory declarations that he mentioned have been referred to the Crown Solicitor? Secondly, has he prepared the necessary informations for the Chief Inspector of Factories to lay before the President of the Industrial Court? Thirdly, if he has, will the Premier say why these informations have not been so laid?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This matter concerns not only the Minister of Labour and Industry but (because the Crown Solicitor's Department is involved) the Attorney-General as well. I shall obtain a report from both Ministers.

WATERFRONT COMMITTEE.

Mr. HALL: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears an article headed "Inquiry Begun on River Areas". The article states that the Government-appointed Water Recreational Areas Committee has begun its quest for information, and that notices have been sent to councils with frontages to the Murray River. Although there are other references,

I can find nothing about coastal foreshore areas. Will the Minister of Lands say whether this worthwhile committee will extend its activities to investigating coastal foreshore areas, which investigation could be useful for development?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, it will. This committee has commenced its investigations and, as a preliminary move, letters have been sent to all the municipalities and district councils between Goolwa and Mannum. The letters set out the committee's purposes, explain what it intends to do, and seek co-operation from the councils. It is intended that the committee will visit the lower reaches of the Murray River soon to investigate requirements there. However, I assure the honourable member that the committee's investigations will not only include the river areas, but be extended to include all waterways and coastal foreshores, as suggested by the honourable member. Since the honourable member has spoken in the House about this matter and referred to beaches not far from Adelaide (such as St. Kilda and Port Gawler), the matter has been discussed with the Chairman of this committee (Mr. Donaldson), and he agrees with the honourable member that these areas need development, too. He has assured me that these areas will receive a high priority in the committee's investigations. I have also received a request from those concerned in Port Pirie to see whether an investigation could be made there regarding small craft, and I have given an assurance that, in its turn, Port Pirie will receive consideration. The committee will thoroughly investigate all waterways in regard to future recreational needs, and it will probably take some time to come to a conclusion. I am sure that it will bring down useful recommendations for the Government to consider.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question whether the South Australian Egg Board will be able to take advantage of the reported shortage of eggs in New Zealand?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have been informed by the Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board that no surplus exists in South Australia. However, now that the honourable member has drawn this matter to my attention, I have asked the Chairman whether he will refer it to the Commonwealth authorities so that this useful information will be available to them.

FISHING.

Mr. McANANEY: Professional fishermen in my district have agitated for separate licences for professional fishermen and amateur fishermen. As they are a little perturbed about the falling away of crayfish catches, they have also asked that a limit be imposed in respect of crayfish pots. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has made a decision on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Recently, at the request of the honourable member for Millicent, I listened to representations from fishermen at Millicent. Also present at the meeting as observers were fishermen from the honourable member's district, from the West Coast, and from Port Adelaide. The request made was similar to that referred to by the honourable member except that the views of some fishermen present differed from the views of South Coast fishermen concerning crayfish pot limits. Since then, I have received strong representations from people who fish as a part-time living protesting against any such move as that suggested by fishermen at the meeting. The Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation has prepared a lengthy report for me on the matter; I have read it and given it some consideration but, as yet, I have not reached any decision on the matter nor have I taken it to Cabinet. Of course, before anything can be done, the matter will have to be taken to Cabinet for further discussion. However, at this stage I have not reached a conclusion.

TELEVISION MAST.

Mr. RODDA: Although my question deals with a Commonwealth matter, it affects people in my district and those in the whole of the South-East. Yesterday, a 500ft. television mast at Mount Burr crashed to the ground. For a long time people in the South-East have awaited the introduction of telecasts from Mount Burr and, of course, this unfortunate occurrence will delay their introduction. Will the Premier ascertain from the Postmaster-General's Department whether residents of the South-East and of the adjoining districts of Victoria can expect telecasts to be made from the South-East station?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* that the South Australian Deputy Director of the department and others were proceeding to the South-East to ascertain the damage. I shall endeavour to obtain a report.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Those of us associated with agriculture are aware of the importance of superphosphate in the cost sheet of production. I understand that an officer of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has perfected a technique for assessing phosphate in light, sandy soils. Can the Minister of Agriculture verify the truth of this claim and will he ascertain whether, if the cost of installing such equipment is not excessive, his department would consider setting up a section to deal with this aspect of soil analysis?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will take up the matter with the department, and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

URRBRAE AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Education information on the programme of development of the Urrbrae Agricultural High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed by the Director of the Public Buildings Department as follows:

Tender documents are being finalized and a detailed estimate of cost is being prepared for the proposed new workshop block at the Urrbrae Agricultural High School. A submission will be made within the next few days for approval of funds for the project. Subject to this approval being obtained, it is anticipated that tenders will be called later this month. Provision was made on the Loan Estimates for 1965-66 for the construction of this workshop block and it is not proposed to depart from this programming. Provision was also made on the Loan Estimates for 1965-66 for expenditure on the design of the new major additions, estimated to cost about £250,000. These buildings were not planned to be under construction during the current financial year 1965-66, and the letting of a contract next year will depend on the availability of funds in that year.

HILLS FREEWAY.

Mr. SHANNON: The Premier created a most favourable impression when addressing a well attended and enthusiastic meeting at the Stirling Institute last night. I know that he is well aware of the aims and objects for which that meeting was called. Will he take up with his Cabinet colleagues the desirability of engaging a thoroughly competent landscape architect to assist in masking the scars in our undulating country through which must of necessity pass some of the new freeways, so that the work of rehabilitating the country can proceed concurrently with the

roadwork and thus enable the scars to be hidden at the earliest possible moment?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to consider the matter. However, I am inclined to the view that instead of engaging some outside landscape architect we should try to ascertain whether the talent for this job is available amongst our own young local architects. Of course, that is on a broader topic. I have no fault to find with the engineers any more than I have with architects. I think that as a result of the combined experience of the two groups some further information could be obtained on this important subject. For instance, if the Highways engineers recommend a freeway route that would spoil the beauty of the area, further joint consideration by the architects and designers will be necessary. I will have a further examination made and see what can be done.

LIFESAVERS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the possibility of introducing an insurance fund for surf lifesavers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: An arrangement has been in existence for some years whereby all surf lifesavers engaged on official duties and training are covered by a policy of insurance arranged by the State Centre of the Surf Lifesaving Association of Australia. The premiums are payable two-thirds by the national council of the association, from a grant made by a cigarette manufacturer, and one-third by the individual clubs on the basis of the number of active members. The policy provides cover for death or disablement whilst members are effecting rescues; engaged on official patrols; launching or handling boats, boards or skis; engaged on organized training; moving equipment; and carrying out duties as directed by a club official. The policy provides for a payment of £1,000 for death or total disability, £500 for certain prescribed partial disabilities, a weekly payment of £10 for a maximum of 52 weeks whilst incapacitated as a result of an injury, and a maximum of £50 for medical expenses in respect of any one accident. The Government makes a grant to assist the finances of the association. This grant has been at the rate of £1,500 a year, but the amount has been increased as from this year to £2,000.

SCHOOL FIRE DRILL.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education an answer to my recent question regarding

the possibility of introducing fire drill in schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Fire drill is already carried out in departmental schools. An Education Department circular directs heads of schools as follows:

- (a) In the case of solid-construction school buildings, fire drills involving the evacuation of the classrooms by the children are to be held at least annually.
- (b) In the case of wooden school buildings (which are all of one-storey construction) fire drills involving the evacuation of the children from the classrooms, using the emergency exits provided, are to be held once each term, provided that these drills may be held more frequently if in any particular case the head of the school considers that special circumstances warrant this being done.

In every school the head of the school will determine the actual date on which the drill will take place and will be responsible for the detailed arrangements which may be necessary.

GOODWOOD ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few minutes ago the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Minister of Local Government, laid on the table of the House the 45th annual report of the Garden Suburb Commissioner. I wonder whether the Minister had an opportunity to read it before he laid it on.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a pity. There are two matters in the report to which I desire to draw his attention and hope that he will raise them with his colleague. As he has not read the report, I shall read just a couple of sentences to draw his attention to these matters. On page 3, the Commissioner refers to the state of the Goodwood Road as it passes through the Garden Suburb, and he says:

The increased traffic now using this road, in excess of 10,000 vehicles daily for an average day, is reflected in the deterioration in the road surface which appears to be rapidly reaching the stage where the limited maintenance being effected will be insufficient to maintain the roadway in a condition to safely carry the traffic. Necessary reconstruction is beyond the limited resources of the Garden Suburb.

He goes on to say that approaches were made to the Commissioner of Highways, and he ends this part of the report by saying:

Until recently funds and staff have not been available for this purpose, but the Highways Department has the problem now in hand and has commenced design for reconstruction, although no plans or specifications are available at the present time.

It is that last phrase to which I desire to draw the Minister's attention. I am sure the Premier would agree that it is most urgent and important that this roadway should be reconstructed. Will the Minister of Education especially bring to the notice of his colleague this passage from the Garden Suburb Commissioner's report in the hope that something can be done about it speedily? The other matter I refer to is on page 5 of the report, and deals with the hall in the Garden Suburb. The Commissioner states:

Revenue from the Garden Suburb Hall amounted to £254 19s. 6d. which is comparable with the revenue of previous years. Facilities available are substandard and are not such as would encourage the hiring of the premises for social functions. Its structure has deteriorated further since receipt of the report of the South Australian Housing Trust in 1960 to the effect that the structure was generally in a poor condition and inadequate for both administrative and community functions, and that the erection of a new building on another site was the only satisfactory solution if anything substantial was to be achieved.

The Commissioner goes on to say briefly that approval was sought at that time for an approach to the ratepayers, but the Minister of Local Government has not yet given that approval. Will the Minister of Education refer these passages to his colleague to see whether the Minister will now give approval so that a new hall may be provided in the Garden Suburb and residents in that suburb have the benefit of facilities which for some time have been readily available to others in much newer suburbs of the city of Adelaide?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In some country areas electricity is supplied by a company working under a franchise. A subsidy is given so that the cost of electricity can be reduced to within 10 per cent of the price paid in the grid system. However, I have been informed that this does not apply to Commonwealth instrumentalities. I hope this information is not correct, because it would be extremely bad policy to have a higher price paid by a Commonwealth instrumentality than that paid by others. Can the Minister of Works say whether Commonwealth instrumentalities are excluded from the benefit of the subsidy?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am surprised to hear that statement, but there may be reasons for it, although I am not commit-

ting myself by saying that. I shall inquire and inform the Leader when I have a reply.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It has been brought to my attention that several properties, the purchase of which was assisted under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, have subsequently been sold. Can the Premier say how many properties have been sold after purchase, and why they have been sold? Also, will he ascertain how many applications have been received since the State Bank imposed the limit of £15,000 on any one loan application?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If possible, I shall obtain the necessary information and inform the honourable member.

VIRGINIA WATER BASIN.

Mr. HALL: In this morning's newspaper and on news sessions during the weekend, it was announced that the Government intended to proclaim the Underground Waters Preservation Act and to take action to preserve the Virginia Basin. The reason given was the continual dropping of the water level in the basin, and the danger from contamination by lower-quality waters adjacent to the basin. The Government's action will govern many things: prospective gardeners will be uncertain about entering this district to earn their living; and prospective sellers of land will be in a quandary about its value and about the demand for it. There will be a huge question mark over the vegetable-growing industry in the district. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Mines to clarify the Government's intentions regarding the proclamation and operation of this Act in the Virginia area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I could give the honourable member some information now, but I prefer to discuss the matter with my colleague, and will inform the honourable member tomorrow.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the development of the Gidgealpa field and the bringing of gas to Adelaide?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The feasibility study currently being carried out by Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited on behalf of the South Australian Government is concerned with the economics of delivering natural gas to Adelaide from Gidgealpa, Gilmore and the Mereenie area, to supply the estimated market requirements. In addition to engineering

aspects, such as pipeline routes, pipe diameters, etc., the capital and operating costs will be considered, together with various methods of providing finance. I have no further information available.

DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the dismissal of Dr. Gillis?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have satisfied myself that it was clear to Dr. Gillis that the action which he took in relation to the patient Mrs. X was contrary to the directions of his own Minister and of the Attorney-General as to the proper position. As to the instructions by the officer of the Hospitals Department to Dr. Gillis on June 15, I set forth in full the minute of the Secretary of the department, the only alteration being in the name of the patient concerned (Mrs. X):

Mrs. X a patient at Morris Hospital, left that hospital on Tuesday, June 15, 1965. However, it is understood that the Medical Superintendent, Dr. S. Gillis, notified the police of her departure and as a result the police arrested her and returned her to the hospital apparently as they understood that the warrant dated December 14, 1964, and executed on January 26, 1965, was still in effect.

Following discussions between officers of this department, the Secretary of the Department of Public Health (Mr. Bray) and the Under-Secretary, the Assistant Secretary of this department (Mr. B. C. Kemp), acting on instructions from the Under-Secretary, contacted Dr. Gillis by telephone at the Chest Clinic at about 2.45 p.m. on June 15, 1965, and instructed him that Mrs. X must be released from hospital forthwith and, furthermore, provided with a taxi service order to enable her to travel to any destination she desired. Dr. Gillis claimed that, in accordance with precedents concerning patients retained in hospital by warrant, Mrs. X was not due for release until six months after the date of execution of the warrant, but he was clearly told that in this particular case the Crown Solicitor had ruled that there was no power to retain her in hospital beyond June 14, 1965. As Dr. Gillis was engaged with patients at the Chest Clinic, he requested that Mr. Kemp contact the Matron at Morris Hospital regarding Mrs. X's discharge.

This was done promptly and the Lay Superintendent was also contacted regarding the issue of the taxi service order. Dr. Gillis had requested that he be given written confirmation of the telephoned instruction, and later telephoned to say that he would visit this office at 4 p.m. to take delivery of such written confirmation. I considered that this was not necessary and therefore had a long discussion with Dr. Gillis later in the afternoon. In the meantime, I had had the opportunity to peruse the correspondence in this docket and was therefore able to point out to Dr. Gillis that I was even more firmly

of the opinion that there was no necessity for him to be given any further written instruction on this matter, in view of the fact that the letter dated September 24, 1964, written by the Crown Solicitor directly to Dr. Gillis, contained the following statement:

The period of six months commences from December 14, and the issue of a warrant during this period of six months will not prolong the effect of the order beyond June 14, 1965.

and that following Dr. Gillis's querying this matter he was advised in writing by his immediate superior, the Director of Tuberculosis, in a letter dated May 6, 1965, that:

Dr. Woodruff has requested me to advise you of the Crown Solicitor's opinion regarding the date of termination of Mrs. X's compulsory period in hospital, which is that unless Mrs. X obtains an order under Section 416f (2) of the Health Act, her hospital term, pursuant to the Special Magistrate's order of December 14, 1964, will end on June 15, 1965, or at such earlier date as she may be lawfully released.

The interview with Dr. Gillis concluded by making it very clear to him that it was not proposed to give him any written confirmation of that day's telephoned instruction concerning Mrs. X but that a record would be made in the docket of the whole of the circumstances. (Signed, J. L. Moule, Secretary of the Hospitals Department.)

To suggest that the communication of the Crown Solicitor's and Attorney-General's opinions as to the law were mere advice which Dr. Gillis was at liberty to disregard is absurd. It is emphasized that after his interview with the Secretary of the department Dr. Gillis communicated to the police and to his Minister his intention to endeavour to have Mrs. X re-arrested. I do not intend to enlarge further on this matter. A full report covering all aspects of the case has been given to the House.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Premier say whether the State Bank and the Savings Bank have given preferential treatment to applications from country people for advances under the Advances for Homes Act? If there has been a change of policy, and if preference is not granted to these applicants, can the Premier explain the change?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that I reported to the House that applications to the Savings Bank were considered in order of receipt, unless the applicant had deposited £1,000 for at least six months, or something like that. However, I understand that there may have been preference in respect of country applicants for Housing Trust accommodation. Other than the State Bank, I know of no authority that gave preference one way or the

other. The Government finds the money and the bank allocates it.

Mr. Nankivell: Three months was the accepted waiting period: has that been changed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If there is anything different, I shall obtain the necessary information and inform the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was informed only last evening that the policy in respect of money available to the State Bank for country housing had been altered. Will the Premier ascertain whether there has been any change of policy on the part of the State Bank that might adversely affect house building in the country?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The bank has informed me of no change, but I shall obtain a report.

WITERA BASIN.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice):

1. What steps have been taken to ascertain the size of the underground water basin known as the Witera Basin?

2. Have any calculations been made as to its probable capacity?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to develop this basin so that water can be reticulated throughout the districts of Port Kenny, Colley and Mount Cooper?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The replies are:

1. An investigation of the Witera Basin was made by the Mines Department in April, 1960, and a report submitted to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, recommending the construction of four trial bores.

2. The capacity of individual bores or wells is thought to be limited to less than 1,000 gallons an hour.

3. An investigation was made by the Mines Department into the Witera Basin in 1960, and its report indicated that the supply in this basin was limited. A small quantity of water could be obtained by the sinking of bores in the area but this would only be suitable for stock purposes in adjoining local areas. It was considered that no useful purpose would be served by further investigations in this basin, and funds available have been used in investigating more promising basins on Eyre Peninsula. The basin is not suitable for development for reticulation of the Port Kenny, Colley and Mount Cooper districts.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on South-Western Suburbs Floodwaters Drainage Scheme (Drain No. 10) together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 30. Page 1886.)

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Libraries Department, £408,553.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The salary of the Principal Librarian is substantially the same this year as it was last year (£3,522). This office has been filled with considerable distinction for some years by Mr. Hedley Brideson. I think I am correct in saying that the salary paid to the Librarian of the Barr Smith Library at the university is on a par with that paid to the professorial staff at the university, and is substantially more than this sum. I do not use that comparison to compare the two gentlemen personally, but it has always seemed to me that the duties of Mr. Brideson, as Principal Librarian of the Public Library, warrant a substantially higher salary than that paid to him. Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government has considered this matter and, if it has not, will he say whether it will consider it? I believe that a strong case can be made out for a substantial increase in Mr. Brideson's salary.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I agree with the honourable member that a strong case can be made out not only in respect of an increase for the Principal Librarian but in respect of increases for other librarians, too. In fact, the library has been experiencing the utmost difficulty in maintaining a staff of skilled librarians. The matter has been under the consideration of the Government, and we hope to do something in this regard as soon as possible.

Mr. HALL: I take it that the Minister is aware of some negotiations that have been taking place over the last couple of years (although not so actively of late) between the Institutes Association and the Libraries Board, concerning a mutual arrangement between them whereby subsidized libraries could be established on a relatively small scale in institute

buildings. Indeed, conferences were held with representatives of the association, the board and the Minister.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Under the previous Government?

Mr. HALL: Yes, and about 12 months ago the former Minister of Education, when opening the annual general meeting of the Institutes Association, said that it was hoped that two trial towns would be selected, where books supplied by the Libraries Board would be put into institute libraries, or into rooms adjacent to them, and that one librarian would manage the two sections. Subsequently, it was mentioned that 500 books would be made available. As a member of the Institutes Association, I point out that at one stage we thought the scheme would be implemented, but I have heard of no definite plans since then. Has the Minister, since assuming his portfolio, heard anything about this scheme? If he has, will he say what progress has been made? If he has not, will he consider the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am not aware of all the circumstances referred to by the honourable member, but I will examine them.

Line passed.

Museum Department, £77,837; Art Gallery Department, £41,491—passed.

Miscellaneous, £6,266,004.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like from the Minister much more information concerning grants to the University of Adelaide and concerning the Government's policy on the hall of residence at Bedford Park. I assume that the latter is included in the line "Residential Colleges". It has been stated in Canberra that the South Australian Government has rejected outright an offer by the Commonwealth Universities Commission to provide £200,000 towards residential colleges in South Australia. The Treasurer could not give me much information in reply to a question I asked this afternoon. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Commonwealth Government has made an offer of substantially 50 per cent of the cost of halls of residence? Has this offer been refused by the State Government and, if it has, does that mean that this money has been lost for all time or does it mean that the grant has been deferred and can be taken up subsequently? I believe there should be a material objection if the money has been lost. What is the general policy of

the Government on this matter? The Universities Commission, over some years, made recommendations regarding subsidies to assist university work and, up to the present, every subsidy has been availed of by the State Government. Therefore, the university has had the utmost benefit from recommendations of the Universities Commission. At a time when we are so deficient in many of our educational institutions it would be a mistaken policy to hesitate in accepting assistance from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The allocation of £5,082,000 to the University of Adelaide was approved by Cabinet after consideration of the university's budget, and is an increase of £612,790 over the previous year's expenditure. The line dealing with residential colleges has nothing to do with the proposed hall of residence at Bedford Park. The Government is unable to provide the matching grant of £220,000 within the triennium ending in 1966, but negotiations are in progress with Senator Gorton with a view to that sum being carried forward into the next triennium. Matching grants were previously discussed with Senator Gorton when I visited Canberra with the Director of Education, an officer of the Treasury, and Prof. Karmel. In dealing with the whole question of expenditure on Bedford Park, we thoroughly discussed matching grants and the possibility of their being taken into the next triennium. Senator Gorton said that if a matching grant had to be carried into the next triennium it would be at the temporary expense of the equivalent amount in the next triennium. Therefore, the Government has approached Senator Gorton with a view to virtually delaying the hall of residence at Bedford Park for 12 months. It is expected that we will be able to start the site works towards the end of 1966, and obtain the £220,000 grant from the Commonwealth, out of a total of £440,000 for the hall of residence, within the next triennium, which will be 1967-69. That is the position at present but I could bring down a more detailed report. In fact, a public statement has already been prepared on the matter and will appear in the newspapers during the next day or so.

Mrs. STEELE: I notice with some regret that there is a decrease of £24,225 for residential colleges. Will the Minister say whether the grants to these colleges are based on applications for assistance on behalf of the various colleges, and whether the decrease reflects the fact that not as much was asked for this year as was asked for in previous years? Last week the members of the Council

of the Institute of Technology met the Chairman of the committee set up under the Martin committee (Dr. Ian Wark). Dr. Wark said he hoped that, with the building of the new Institute of Technology in the grounds allocated to it at Islington, provision would be made for a residential college, because he thought residential colleges contributed much to the life of the student. I know that Whyalla hopes to see this type of development. The Minister of Education is aware that an offer was made by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, but because of the financial position at that time the council could not accept it. This is something to which the committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Wark, is obviously turning its mind. Of course, it will require the co-operation and financial support of the State.

Through the interest of the Minister of Education, an invitation has been extended to members of Parliament to have dinner with the staff and students at St. Ann's College later this month to let members know just what takes place in a women's college working within the university. I have accepted that invitation and I hope other members will accept. I believe that a big percentage of the girls who attend have come from high schools throughout the State. I should be interested to hear from the Minister the position regarding the decrease in grants to residential colleges this year. I ask him to lend his support to the greatest possible extent when further grants to colleges are being considered.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I regret that I am unable to give the honourable member any information other than that the £100,000 provided here is an approved grant from the Commonwealth Government. I will obtain a report on the other details requested. Having regard to the previous question by the Leader, I emphasize that, when it is said that it is a great pity that the State should miss any opportunity of getting the full grant from the Commonwealth, it should not be overlooked that the percentage enrolments in our schools in South Australia since 1945 (and those enrolments result in increased expenditure at the university and at the Institute of Technology) are far greater than those in any other State. In fact, the increase is 186 per cent, whereas the Australian average increase is 117 per cent and the New South Wales increase is 91 per cent. In other words, this increase of enrolments has placed an almost intolerable financial burden upon education in South Australia, and this should always be borne in

mind when people say that we should not miss out on any matching grant from the Commonwealth. We do not want to miss out on anything at all, and every effort is being made to see that we get the money provided by the Commonwealth. There may be cases of slight delay because of the reasons I mentioned earlier.

Mr. HALL: I am concerned about the rate of increase in the kindergarten vote. I understand that about five years ago the then Treasurer laid down some sort of rule that the amount granted for increased facilities each year for the following five years would be £5,000 yearly, and that the extra increases over the £5,000 would be for extra expenses incurred by the Kindergarten Union (and outside its control) in maintaining the *status quo*. I understand that agreement ended last year, so we have coming up for review the amount to be allocated to the Kindergarten Union for expansion work each year. All I have been able to ascertain is that the amount still stands at £5,000 yearly, and that the extra £2,900 this year is simply to maintain the previous position. I hope the Minister of Education will not think I am being political in this, but I emphasize that this amount allocated for expansion of kindergartens is inadequate.

Mr. Millhouse: This affects the whole State.

Mr. HALL: Yes, but I know most about the demand that exists in my own area, which I think would have a greater rate of increase than have many other areas. The Parafield Gardens area, which is increasing in population, will find it difficult to arrange for a kindergarten this year because the vote is insufficient to cover all new areas. The people have saved money towards the capital cost of building a kindergarten but, when it is established, support is needed from the union to pay salaries. Will the Minister, at the earliest opportunity, provide more money to establish new kindergartens?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: New areas that are being quickly populated require a new approach to the establishment of kindergartens and other facilities. These areas have to be assisted because they find it difficult to raise large sums because of the normal living and employment conditions of the people. Much money is required to build kindergartens, and the union cannot be asked for assistance until money has been raised by the local people.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I appreciate what honourable members have said, and also the needs of the districts they have referred

to. I realize that the grant to the union is insufficient, but not enough money is available for a larger grant to be made. The grant approved by Cabinet was based on the Kindergarten Union's budget, and the increase applies to salaries of trainees. I will consider the points raised by honourable members, but I can see no way in which an increase can be granted this year.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that about £200,000 was offered by the Commonwealth Government to assist in establishing a hall of residence at Bedford Park University. If this is correct, can the Minister say whether the Government had knowledge of this offer? I realize that it would not remain available after this year, but was that known to the Government when it declined the offer of assistance? I appreciate that this offer requires a matching grant, but I understand that the money is available only if taken, and if not used, it ceases to be available for this purpose.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is not true that it will not be available for this purpose. I told the Leader that the question of the matching grant, and of the State being able to match it in a particular triennium, was discussed with Senator Gorton and others so that we could be clear about what we were doing. A firm proposition has been made, that the hall of residence be deferred for twelve months so that the matching grant from the Commonwealth will be made available within the next triennium, on the understanding that the grant made during that triennium by the Commonwealth would be reduced by that sum. That, however, does not mean that that sum will be lost; it simply means a deferment of the sum for 12 months.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Over many years the Commonwealth Universities Commission has recommended grants for a period of three years, and has, of course, allocated them to the States. If a State does not take up the grant within a certain period it loses it. It may be that in the next three years a grant will again be recommended, but that does not mean that this sum is not lost. It is lost, because in the next three years additional moneys will be recommended for other purposes. South Australia has always taken up every sum that has been provided. It has matched everything advanced by the Commonwealth Government, but some other States, where the grant has not been matched, have inevitably lost it. Halls of residence in South Australia are urgently needed, and this is

borne out by the fact that St. Ann's College has received a special allocation.

Accommodation at a reasonable rate must be made available for country students if they are to enjoy similar opportunities to those enjoyed by city students. Any delay in this matter will mean that the university and the Government will ultimately lose the grant, because in its next programme the commission will allocate to each State an appropriate sum of money, but we shall not receive an extra sum. Indeed, this is backed up by the commission's previous decisions. We shall receive only the sum that we would have received if we had taken up this particular appropriation. A Commonwealth Government member has said that the South Australian Government is not taking up the advances of money available to it for education here, and has added, "What is the purpose, as far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned, in saying that South Australia is not receiving enough money for education?"

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I am putting to you that you are not stating the full situation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before I raised the question in Committee, I asked the Treasurer to give me information on it, and he said he would get a report. I have asked the Minister, and he has definitely said that the matter has been deferred until 1966. If it is deferred until then, it is deferred to the next triennium, and it ceases to apply to this triennium. If it were deferred until 1966, I do not think the commission would recommend it now and then say it was not necessary in the next triennium. This £220,000 would be merged with the sums available to the State in the next triennium. It is almost the universal practice of universities to provide accommodation for students, and South Australia has been lagging in this respect over a period of years.

The large universities in the Eastern States are well to the fore in this regard, and we are far behind. I am not blaming the Government for that. Indeed, I should probably blame myself, but when we have the unique opportunity of obtaining from the Commonwealth Government such a sum of money as this, and when we reject it, it is inexcusable, particularly as this university will undoubtedly have to meet the State's requirements for a long time, because it is difficult to see decentralization of university education in the near future. Will the Minister again have this matter examined, and ascertain whether a special provision could be made to enable us

to take advantage of the Commonwealth Government's grant—in this case, a 50 per cent grant in respect of the cost of this accommodation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have already explained to the Leader of the Opposition the precise arrangements concerning this matter, as well as a letter that has been sent to Senator Gorton containing a certain proposition. I have not yet received a reply from the Senator, but if anybody has said that we have rejected the grant outright, and that we shall lose this money, I say that that is misrepresenting the case. If anybody should be concerned about the failure of this State to provide sufficiently for university education, then the previous Government stands condemned. From my knowledge as Minister of Education, I can say that, unless we had taken the steps we have taken to increase the allowance to student teachers, we would have been in an even worse position than we were when this Government came into office, as regards the supply of secondary school teachers. Therefore, when the Leader talks in this strain he should remember what happened while his Government was in office. This Government is just as anxious to get grants from the Commonwealth as is the Leader. When he uses the term "losing the money", this would be accurate only if South Australia and the other States ceased to exist at the end of this triennium. However, they will not cease to exist and what will happen is that the grant will simply be deferred for 12 months. When a thing is deferred it is not lost. I suggest that the Leader was not presenting the position fairly, after receiving my explanation. We are anxious to provide a hall of residence and to make accommodation available for country students. Since coming into office, we have done much for country students that was badly needed. If the Leader cares to examine what we have done in this regard he will see that what I say is true. If necessary, I will enumerate what the Government has done in this place.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the Leader in the plea he has made to the Government on this matter, but on a broader ground than he took, valid though his ground was. In my view, all students, if it is humanly possible, should attend a residential college, and live in at the university; university education is not complete unless it contains that residential element. I know that in Australia and in South Australia it is not possible at present to achieve that goal but it is the goal toward

which we should be working. The provision of halls of residence and university colleges is of prime importance, and I hope that the Government will not let slip any chance of getting additional money for this purpose.

The members for Gouger and Alexandra have referred to the need for kindergartens in their districts. In the hills part of my district (which represents only about one-third of the District of Mitcham) there are five kindergartens, all of which have waiting lists, and there is room for many more. Therefore, it is not only in the new housing areas that an urgent need for kindergarten accommodation exists. An increase of about £613,000 is provided for the University of Adelaide. Will the Minister say whether any of that increase is to go towards fees concessions to students at the University of Adelaide, and whether fees have been reduced there since the present Government came into office?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to check on that for the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the Minister is prepared to check on this. In fact, in answer to a question on August 10, he set out the Australian Labor Party's policy at the last election, and said that there would be a reduction in university fees for those students who did not have allowances or scholarships. He went on to say that he hoped he would be able to make a statement on the matter within a short time. As far as I know, that statement has not yet been made.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was made in the press.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But not here. There seems to be inconsistency in the approach of various members of the Government to this matter. On the day on which the Minister of Education made his statement the Attorney-General made a Ministerial statement explaining away some remarks that were reported in *On Dit* to the effect that there would be a reduction in all university students' fees.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I never said that at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General said:

Certain questions have been asked in this House about an address which I gave at the university immediately following the elections, and concerning which I was reported in condensed form in the university paper. The honourable member for Alexandra has read some quotations from that paper. At the meeting in question I gave to students the reply which, in effect, the Minister of

Education has read out: that, in relation to those students who were hit by any increase in the fees (that is, those who had no scholarships or those whose fees were not paid by their employers), action would be taken by the Government which would reverse the effect of the action by the previous Government. I made that explanation *in extenso*. The reply quoted by the honourable member from *On Dit* was a very much condensed version of the reply I gave to a question I was asked. My reply was entirely in accordance with the statement made by the Minister of Education.

The report in *On Dit* was a condensation of what must have been a long address by the Attorney-General, and it did not quite "get him" as it should have got him. Another report appeared in the *Sunday Mail* under the heading "Promises to Cut Varsity Fees will be Honoured". This is the relevant part:

"The Labor Government would honor an undertaking given last year that it would reduce the Adelaide university fees," the Attorney-General (Mr. Dunstan) said today. Mr. Dunstan said that the Parliamentary Labor Party had opposed the last increase in fees and would certainly move to have them reduced. Mr. Dunstan said that he had been asked yesterday by University students whether the Government intended to increase students' allowances, but had told them that it did not. There had been no Labor Party policy adopted on this, although allowances to student teachers would be improved.

It seems to me that the effect of the report is precisely the same as the effect of the report in *On Dit*. It is a strange coincidence that both papers reported him straight out in that way. Be that as it may, I should be pleased to know just what the Government has done regarding university fees, what it intends to do, and, in particular, whether this £600,000-odd does represent some step in the direction of reducing university fees.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I go back to a statement made a few moments ago by the Minister of Education regarding this £220,000. The moment I raised this question the Minister saw fit to take it as a criticism of his Government and proceeded to cast aspersions on my Government. Of course, that does not in any way solve the problem. I do not know whether my Government, when in office, solved education problems any better than this Government is solving them, but I can say that in the whole of the period my Government was in office it never refused Commonwealth money, and the university received the maximum benefit of Commonwealth grants available. The matching grant was provided on every occasion to the maximum amount, and

indeed I can say that I personally went to Melbourne to interview the Universities Commission to ask that the amount be increased.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And we never knocked back a penny.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so. I still want to know whether it is going to be the policy of this State to look a gift horse in the mouth. When there is £220,000 available for something that is urgently needed, are we going to let that opportunity slide or are we going to take it? The Commonwealth has said that we have rejected £220,000.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Senator Gorton hasn't said so to me yet.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister himself said he has asked for it to be deferred until the next triennium, and that is equivalent to wiping it off because at the next triennium it will be considered with the amount of money that comes to this State.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: So far as the university is concerned, it is £440,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so. I am concerned not so much with the amount but with the fact that we have shown a reluctance to use money available to us. University accommodation in this State is not up to the standard of other States; I have already said that and I have taken some responsibility for the defect. Therefore, this question is urgent, because it has for too long been deferred. We have an opportunity of remedying the defect; to lightly pass it over seems to me to be bad policy, and all the criticism the Minister likes to make of the previous Government will not shut me up in saying so.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It was a responsible Commonwealth member and a colleague of Senator Gorton's who told me that, if this money were not taken up by the State, it would be lost. Can the Minister say whether the deferment of the amount means that it will be added to our total in the next three years?

Mr. McANANEY: I am concerned at the postponement or deferment of this amount. I have had considerable experience of secondary and tertiary students, and I know that there is a much higher pass rate at those residential colleges where they can have tutorials and get somewhere quiet to study. It would cost a tremendous sum to have all students in residential colleges, but it would be cheaper in the long run if we could raise the very low pass rate at the university through having students at these residential colleges. I think every effort should be made to have

residential colleges even if we have to get rid of a few public relations officers.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Auditor-General's Report states:

Pursuant to the Institute of Technology Act, 1892-1959, the audit of books and accounts of that activity is carried out by the Auditor-General and the financial statements are published in this report. The books and accounts of the university and the Waite Agricultural Research Institute are not subject to audit or review by the Auditor-General as is the case with universities in other States.

Over £5,000,000 has been voted for the university this year. Is the Minister of Education satisfied with the audit being carried out by the university, or should some notice be taken of the Auditor-General's statement?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall consider the point raised by the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The sum of £176 has been provided for the Mortlock Park Children's Playground as a contribution towards the cost of part-time supervision. As this sum has not changed for a long time, will the Minister consider whether it can be increased?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This sum was provided for supervision done by people other than teachers. The department considers that, as supervision of children during school hours can be done by teachers, there is no reason to increase this amount.

Mr. CUMBE: Will the administrative headquarters of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia and the union's training college, both in North Adelaide, receive increases this year, apart from the normal increases to metropolitan kindergartens?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall get that information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY.

Department of Labour and Industry, £177,674; Miscellaneous, £7,745—passed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS.

Minister of Agriculture Department, £10,646—passed.

Agriculture Department, £1,100,218.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: An amount of £185,550 has been provided for the Research Centres Branch but no details are shown. Some years ago a recommendation was made to the department that the property at Blackwood should be closed, as it had completed its useful work, and that one at Lenswood should be promoted. The Auditor-

General's Report shows that expenditure at the Blackwood orchard for 1961 was about £8,000; for 1962, about £8,000; for 1963, about £9,000; for 1964, about £10,000; and for 1965, about £9,000. This indicates that the programme seems to have been maintained, whereas the net cost for the Lenswood property for 1964 was £356 and for 1965, £514. Can the Minister of Agriculture say how much is provided this year for Lenswood and what the development programme is for that centre? Can he also itemize the accounts for each of the research stations, as it is impossible to see what each centre is doing with the present set-up of accounts?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot say offhand what amount is to be spent at Lenswood. I know that work is well in hand for the closing of the Blackwood property and for the promotion of Lenswood. I am sure that the programme will be stepped up for this purpose in the next financial year. I shall obtain the relevant figures for the Leader.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am pleased to hear that the programme for the Lenswood centre will be stepped up. Unless the Lenswood property is adequately developed, the important horticultural industry in the hills, close to the metropolitan area, will not have the benefit of a research centre. I regretted the decision to close the Blackwood experimental station, but I assumed it was necessary. Can the Minister say whether a manager has been appointed to the Lenswood centre and what the staff will be?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret that I have no information regarding staff at present. However, I recently received a deputation from apple and pear growers who made submissions about staff living on the property. This matter has been referred to the department, but I have not yet received a report.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Regarding the increase in respect of fruit fly control, does the Minister intend to spend any of that sum on maintaining road blocks at Murrayville and Bordertown?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This figure includes a provision of £16,000 for a fresh outbreak which, of course, we hope will not occur. Fruit fly research and the maintaining of road blocks have been considerably stepped up. I hope that the Mile End depot's increased programme will have beneficial results in the future. Because it has been found that green bananas (and not necessarily only ripe bananas) can become infested by fruit fly, extra

vigilance has had to be maintained at the Mile End depot, and this has added to the costs under this line. If the sum provided for a fresh outbreak does not have to be spent (and I hope it will not) I assure the honourable member that it will not be wasted.

Mr. Freebairn: Will road blocks be maintained at Bordertown and Murrayville?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Not at the moment, but periodical checks are made at all border crossings. The main road blocks are situated at a point above Renmark, near Whyalla, and at Ceduna.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister say whether a fruit fly inspector is on duty every day of the week on the Overland express, as it approaches Adelaide from Melbourne? I understand that one inspector boards the train at Mount Lofty, but, when returning from Melbourne a few weeks ago on a Sunday, I noticed that no such inspector approached me to ask whether I was carrying fruit. Having inquired of a conductor, I was informed that no inspector was on duty on a Sunday. Is that so?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have not travelled on the Overland on a Sunday, but I understood that inspectors were on duty every day. Inspectors are on duty at the airport, too. I shall endeavour to obtain the information for the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister say whether the functioning of research centres is set out in a specific report somewhere? They are itemized, of course, in the Auditor-General's Report but, unfortunately, only in regard to net costs. A research centre should be able to function profitably, and certainly without incurring heavy losses. I am concerned to see that one modest research station is costing £15,000 net to the taxpayers, and that the net cost of another one has risen to £23,000. Will the Minister explain this position?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall endeavour to obtain this information for the Leader.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Leader has said that certain experimental farms operate at a loss. However, I believe that an experimental farm does not necessarily need to show a profit. It is an applied field of research so that farmers can benefit without having to suffer a loss themselves. As has been the case in the past, we are looking at agriculture as though it were a stereotyped department: we are giving no thought to changing its set-up. The Minister has told me that there are about

40 vacancies in the department and that there is general concern about its morale. There have been suggestions that the whole department needs examination and that it might need a new outlook so that it could provide a better service without additional cost to the taxpayer, and offer encouragement to its officers by giving them additional incentive in the form of promotion.

I suggest to the Minister that he examine the experimental farms to see whether he cannot do away with some. I believe better work can be done on a farm by regional centres. I accept the fact that in horticulture the position may be different. However, in the South-East the research centres are scattered. I do not want to say specifically which centres should be eliminated, but the whole organization should be examined to see whether research centres are serving the purpose for which they were designed. I do not think they are. Consideration should be given to the establishment of a regional centre in the Upper South-East. This type of centre would provide a far better service to the farmer and give a better inducement to the people working in the department. We have started to develop regional centres for administrative purposes, but I do not think they go far enough. A variety of advice should be available from a group of competent officers, and a laboratory should be provided with assistants to help on the farms. Broad acres are not needed; there is now a far wider compass of experimentation.

The capital commitments involved in experimental farms are not needed to get the same information. Decentralized control of regional centres would allow them to become virtually autonomous, and the responsibility would be vested in the various officers in charge, which would give encouragement to officers of the department. This would get away from detailed supervision by hierarchical officers and give more responsibility to other officers in the department, which is what they are looking for. It would do away with much unnecessary red tape (such as the blue forms that have to be signed to account for mileage), which is not in the best interests of the department. However, the position has existed for some time and needs examination. If authority could be regionalized we could have a position similar to that which exists in New South Wales, where responsible officers are in charge around the country. They have subordinates, and the subordinates are responsible for those who work under them. In

this State the position is that all the responsibility is at the top and those in the middle feel that they are left out. The position can arise where younger men on the staff feel they are being neglected. This does not happen in smaller departments.

Much money is spent on experimental farms and, perhaps, it could be more profitably spent. The farming community wants information, particularly on applied research. The sum of £540,000 is voted to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, which carries out fundamental research that is of little value to anybody unless it is applied. To know the application one must know the economics and, to some extent, I believe that this is what the experimental stations should have been doing. I do not believe they are serving in the best interests of the farmer. I hope the Minister will examine the whole set-up of his department to see whether it can be organized more effectively and provide more encouragement in the way of promotion to its officers. If this were done, it would increase the status of the profession. Although the Minister has pointed out to me that about 40 vacancies exist in the department (and I presume many of these are graduate vacancies), there does not seem to be much hope of filling them.

People from overseas are not necessarily suited to the applied field, although they can do excellent work in the scientific research field. I am concerned that we do not seem to be attracting sufficient students in the field of agricultural science. Information I have here discloses that only 12 or 15 students graduate each year, and that six to eight of those students are on some form of cadetship or indenture. The only way to improve this state of affairs is to improve the standard of the profession. If these officers are given better status, if there is more opportunity for them to take responsibility, and if they feel that as individuals they are providing more service to the community, then I think these may be the first steps towards solving what is an unfortunate problem.

As we all know, agriculture is still extremely important to this State, and the economics of production are most important to the average farmer today. He is concerned not only with how he can get a few more bags to the acre or a few more pounds of wool to the acre, but with how he can make most efficient use of machinery and of fertilizers. I think these things can be dealt with to far better advantage if they are dealt with on individual properties rather than on experi-

mental stations, which just perpetuate an old idea and which I think have long served their purpose.

If the Minister of Agriculture does not mind my expressing my views on the question of the Roseworthy Agricultural College, I shall be happy to give my opinion (when we come to the line) on what should be done to relieve the situation that is developing now. I think some of this work that I have suggested can be done in regional centres can be done by people who have merely an associate degree.

Mr. QUIRKE: Whilst I regret that the Blackwood Experimental Orchard is to close, I know that it is not economic to keep it going. In Blackwood there are many trees which probably are the only known growing trees in South Australia of their type, and if all those trees are uprooted we will lose a connecting link with the old cider type of apple grown in England. Amongst those trees is the English russet, which was grown here in the early days. It is a brown apple with a rough, rusty skin and a buttery yellow flesh, priceless in England for the cider industry. We do not grow them any more. We try to make cider out of apples that may not be entirely suitable for that purpose. There is another apple, the winter pearmain, which is no longer a commercial apple, nor could it be because it is not a pretty apple. However, after a person had eaten a winter pearmain he would say it was worth a case of Rome beauties, for it has a magnificent flavour. However, it grows warts and blue patches, and therefore it cannot be considered commercially. We have these trees in Blackwood, and they are named and carefully tended and preserved as varieties. I should like to see some of these old English varieties transferred to the orchard and kept in perpetuity there, for they would be taking up very little space in relation to their importance. I hope that in disbanding the Blackwood orchard some of these things that have been handed down to us (the original fruits that came to this country) will not be entirely lost. Never let it be said that those trees have no value at all: they have, and we might be glad of their particular and peculiar qualities at some future time.

I agree with the member for Albert that some of these experimental broad-acre farms should be looked at. I think there is more reason for getting rid of some of those isolated experimental farms now than there is for getting rid of the Blackwood orchard. Let us get down to putting in regional centres, as New South Wales has done, where one regional

centre covers various forms of agriculture, horticulture, and other forms of production. The entire centre is mapped and all details of its production and habitation are known. I do not think it can be denied that there are many thousands of acres of agricultural land in Australia which, for want of proper extension services, are not producing anywhere near as much as they could. The people on them complain about bad luck in different ways, but the real trouble is that they lack the knowledge. The average South Australian farmer is extremely good, but some farmers are not so good as they think they are, and every year we can see the variations in quantity from property to property. The idea behind the extension services and these regional services in New South Wales is to build up such people.

If there is one thing the South Australian landscape lacks it is trees and shelter for stock. Many trees have been taken off the land. I should not like to assess the loss in production each year as a direct result of lack of shelter. We can travel through miles and miles of sheep country and hardly see a tree worthy of the name, and that condition should be altered. The member for Mount Gambier may not like my saying so, but we should plant eucalypts and not these wretched pine trees, for the latter are not ideal trees for that country.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: They are a commercial tree.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, they do not improve our landscape, nor are they an ideal tree for shelter. We have a magnificent variety of eucalypts. The regional system should be built up so that officers will become interested and have an incentive to do well in each region. It is unfair to expect a Minister to do two jobs, as the present Minister is attempting to do; although he is doing a magnificent job, he should have some relief soon. He should control the Agriculture Department only, so that he can devote more time to that vital department. It is probably the key department in this State, and we will realize how much the State depends on agriculture if we do not receive 2in. of rain within the next two or three weeks. Extension services are necessary because, without them, development will not take place. New discoveries are of great interest and value to this State, but because of insufficient staff to extend them to extension services, the State will not receive the benefit of them. The Government should

appoint a Minister solely concerned with agriculture.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There seems to be no increase in the provision for travelling expenses. When I occupied the office of Minister I was concerned that the advisers had sufficient finance for travel purposes to be able to do their job well. We have an outstanding advisory service in this State, and I have heard it compared with similar services in other parts of the world. Nowhere is there a more personal advisory service than our service, and people who want information can get it merely by asking for it. In order to maintain sufficient funds for travelling purposes, it may be necessary to consider many aspects, including a possible reorganization of the programme of advisers. The department will be under considerable pressure to keep within its travelling expenses vote for this year. How does the Minister intend to manage in the present circumstances, and will there be a reduction in the quality of the advice?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not desire to curtail any services. The member for Alexandra would realize that the amounts are allocated as a result of advice from departmental officers. I should like to extend the services available, as they benefit the farming community. I was pleased to hear the members for Albert and Burra say that they did not want to criticize the present Minister. I appreciate their remarks, because I have been in this situation for about six months and have tried to solve the problems. The shortage of officers in the department fluctuates, and two officers have joined the department only recently. I appreciate the member for Albert's remarks, because he has a wide knowledge of the subject. He said that he was not criticizing this Government or me, as the Minister, because he realized that this was a matter of long standing. I do not remember having heard the member for Burra, when he was the Minister, or the member for Albert making similar comments previously, but I assure both honourable members that their points have been noted.

I shall need all the assistance I can get, because the Agriculture Department is a large one and has many problems. In fact, I have been burning the midnight oil in an attempt to solve some of them and, although I have not been able to do as much as I should like to have done, I hope that some

progress is being made and that more will be achieved soon.

The important matters of cadetships and the training of graduates have been given much airing and, although we realize that we cannot overcome the difficulty immediately but must look to the future, we must endeavour to alleviate the present position, because the need is urgent. It is not only Australia-wide: it is world-wide. Further, it relates not only to agriculture but to all phases of technical administration, and I am sure that all Ministers on the front bench are seeking the right type of officer. Something should have been done before, but it was not, and I am now trying to solve some of the problems. With a view to doing something soon, we obtained the services of an officer who, if he is not already on his way, will be coming shortly. Negotiations in this connection took place with the Agent-General, through my department, before Mr. Strickland went overseas, and we hope to recruit others overseas. We think that we can obtain suitable people who would adapt themselves (which is not always the case) so that some of these vacancies will be filled, but it is not easy to overcome the difficulty in a few months. However, I shall continue to give personal attention to the matter and I thank honourable members for their remarks.

Mr. CURREN: I support the remarks of the member for Albert regarding the value to the primary industries and to the State of the research centres, and emphasize the need for the results of research to be passed on to primary producers. An experimental orchard operated at Berri for about 60 years until it outlived its usefulness. It has now been sold and has been replaced by the Loxton Research Centre, established in the war service land settlement area. This service will greatly benefit not only war service land settlers and other settlers but the whole of the horticultural and viticultural industries.

Some months ago there was an announcement that an insectory was to be established at the Loxton Research Centre for the purpose of assisting in the biological control of orchard pests, such as red scale, that infest the citrus and horticultural plantings. I draw the Minister's attention to a move made a few years ago by the Australian Dried Fruits Association, at the State conference, for the establishment of a commercial insectory where growers could purchase quantities of predators to overcome some particular pest. In fact, I

initiated the move, which came from the Berri branch.

Finally, an insectory was established at the Merbein Research Station in the Sunraysia district of Victoria, and this insectory was financed jointly by the Victorian Department of Agriculture, the Australian Dried Fruits Association (Federal Office), the Commonwealth Development Bank, and the Victorian Citrus Association. The original proposal was that it be a commercial insectory but the objective has been varied somewhat, in that it is to be a research station on predatory insects. Research will be carried out on these predatory insects and information will be given as to what will overcome a particular orchard pest.

I point out that research is already being carried out in Victoria, apparently financed by South Australian growers through their contributions to the Australian Dried Fruits Association, and it will be a pity if the work already being carried out at Merbein near Mildura is duplicated in South Australia, because the research is into horticulture and viticulture and our problems are the same as those in Mildura.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to rural youth. Will the Minister consider the salaries paid to rural youth officers, as I understand that one extremely valuable officer in my district is considering transferring to another department and the Rural Youth Movement can ill afford to lose his valuable services? The movement benefits agricultural districts and at this year's Royal Show we saw a delegation of interested young people, and the benefit of their interest must be evident in agricultural matters. I hesitate to raise the matter because the Minister has to bear the burden of two portfolios. This is a Herculean task, and I commend him for the job he is doing.

Mr. SHANNON: I will support having a ninth Minister as soon as legislation to bring this into effect is introduced, as these two portfolios should not be under one Minister. I imagine that land in the South-East varies as between localities as much as it does in other parts of this State. Some time ago the Public Works Committee visited the southern end of Yorke Peninsula, where it saw at first hand what was being done by the agricultural adviser (Mr. Don Winn) in showing the farmer what could be done by using manganese on apparently useless land. It was found eventually that the most effective means of application was by spray, and experiments were being carried out into the most opportune time to

spray. When there we saw, I think, every member of the local branch of the Agricultural Bureau. This bureau is the best channel I know of to disseminate information to the farmer. I believe we could spend considerably more money on extension services if some experimental farms were cut out. Although they have done good work, they are limited in the types of soil they can work on and they cannot give information in relation to different soil conditions. Farmers could carry out experimental work with the advice of departmental officers. Agriculture will always be a mainstay of this State's economy. If we get rain within a fortnight this season will be an average one but if we do not it will be a bad season. I compliment the Minister on increasing the vote for herd testing. This State now leads the Commonwealth in the production of butterfat per cow. I cannot see any provision for artificial insemination, but I hope this is being carried out.

Mr. FERGUSON: I, too, think it is unnecessary to have so many experimental stations, as the results of the work are not put over to the man on the land. Perhaps once a year field days are held and the farmers are invited, but this is not sufficient to assist farmers. Before experiments into the use of manganese were carried out on Yorke Peninsula, a deputation waited on the then Minister of Agriculture asking that a research centre be set up on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula. The Minister refused the request but told the deputation that he would give farmers there every assistance to solve their problems. However, they were not known then. The department tried to work with the local farmers by means of experimental plots. Because of that, every person interested in cereal-growing in that area has become acquainted with the results of the experiments. I support the members for Albert and Onkaparinga in what they say. There is an increase in the amount provided for aid to the herd-testing associations. Their work is one of the greatest services to men interested in dairying. Production in South Australia from the various herds has been raised to a greater extent than it would have been had this money not been provided. I do not know whether it is solely for herd testing or whether it is also for other things connected with it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A property known as Sims Farm was bequeathed to the department. I notice that provision is made here for vermin and weed control on that property. If it was leased or worked, that expense

could be covered by normal expenditure. Is this property of any benefit to the Government or, although bequeathed in good faith, is it proving an embarrassment to the Government?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The amount involved is a mere £200. Only £146 was spent of last year's allocation. It is wise to maintain this property in good order for the benefit of adjacent landowners.

Mr. Nankivell: Is it leased?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I could not answer that offhand. The insectory building is complete and is expected to be opened in the middle of next month, the opening being combined with a field day at Loxton. I will take up the matter of the Rural Youth Movement personally, because I am concerned about it. If the member for Onkaparinga had looked under "Miscellaneous", he would have seen the money allocated for artificial insemination is diminishing because the board is catching up with its arrears and eventually this will not be a charge against the department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister examine his department's accounting, particularly as it affects research centres? At present the accounts are set out in a group, and there may be something to be said for that, but the headings in these Estimates are not the same as those appearing in the Auditor-General's Report. Sometimes two or three items have to be added together to get the same results as appear in the Auditor-General's Report, and in some cases it is not possible to get a result at all. Honourable members will see, halfway down page 52 of the report, that the amount provided last year for research centres was £217,000. To arrive at the figure for that item under these Estimates, we have, I presume, to go to the Public Buildings Department for the £13,000 set down for "maintenance of buildings"; then to the Treasury Department for the £12,600 set down for "debt charges on Loan funds being interest and sinking fund contributions". Then for "working expenses, materials, etc." and "tools, plant and equipment", we have to add those two items together to get the same result as by adding together two dissimilar lines in the Estimates. They are under totally different headings and classifications.

It is hard enough for honourable members to follow the accounting without having the items mixed up under different headings. In the Auditor-General's Report the amount spent last year on tools, plant and equipment

was £11,000. The same item in the Estimates appears as "Purchase of equipment—£6,000". By adding together those two other items we get substantially the same result. Surely it should be possible to have them classified in the same way for the Estimates as for the Auditor-General's Report? Otherwise, what is the good of the Auditor-General's Report if we have to set about auditing these accounts in the Estimates to see whether they differ from those in the Auditor-General's Report? Will the Minister ensure that the same classification is used in both cases?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is hard to follow, but this seems to be the method that accountants adopt. In this instance, the only departure from the practice of other years is that the itemized research centres are not listed with the exact amounts against them. The overall situation is similar, where salaries and wages are set down in one part and purchases of equipment are set down in another part of the Estimates. I do not think that any departure from previous practice has been made.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What was the reason for not itemizing expenditure?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That was probably to save on printing, but I shall inquire for the Leader.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In regard to fruit fly control (including road blocks) and export fruit experiments in respect of fruit fly, I notice that, whereas £280 was spent last year, no such provision is made this year. Will the Minister explain this omission?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall obtain that information for the honourable member, although I assume provision is no longer required this year.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Will the Minister explain the increase of over £26,000 for the line that includes maintaining road blocks, in relation to fruit fly control?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I said earlier that provision was made in case of fresh outbreaks of fruit fly and for maintaining road blocks and inspection procedures. It is, of course, to be hoped that money will not have to be spent in combating fruit fly outbreaks.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is the number of road blocks being increased?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, although I am not sure where they will be situated. I point out that, if an outbreak occurred, this provision would not be sufficient, anyway, and that further provision would have to be made in the Supplementary Estimates.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I rather resent the statement made by the Minister about last year's setting out of accounts. I point out that the sum necessary for every research station is provided for in last year's Estimates, and that the functions of every department are itemized. To say that the Government was following last year's procedure and to complain about that procedure is unwarranted, because every research station was set out separately in previous years. It is most confusing to the Committee to follow any continuity of practice, or to note what is being spent on any research station in the State. These stations fulfil a remarkable function, and I do not advocate curtailing their activities, although perhaps the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) has a case for suggesting that their activities should be distributed more than they are at present. Will the Minister revert, if possible, to the previous form of accounting, so that any interested person can see what is taking place?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The department has no intention whatever to hide these matters. I offered to obtain the information the Leader sought, and I will certainly ascertain why the practice has been changed this year. Indeed, if it is found to be justified, I shall be prepared to revert to the previous practice.

Mr. HALL: The provision this year in respect of purchasing office machines and equipment is reduced by £2,732 (which is over 50 per cent); the purchase of motor vehicles is reduced by £6,825; and the sum for the purchase of equipment in the Research Centres Branch is reduced by £5,499. It seems a little more than coincidence that all these items are reduced. Can the Minister say whether the policy this year is to economize in the purchase of equipment for use in research and in the purchase of motor vehicles, and can he say whether there has been a carry-over from last year to enable these economies to be made?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have not the information now but I will get it.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support what the Leader said about the drawing up of these Estimates. It is difficult to follow what has happened from last year to this year. In dealing with payments made in respect of the Minister of Agriculture, the Auditor-General stated in his report that other payments of subsidies, advances or assistance included destruction of noxious weeds, £14,600. I cannot find the allocation of that amount under Agriculture

Department in the Estimates. Under "Sims Farm Bequest—Expenses of vermin and weed control" a sum of £200 is proposed. I do not know why the sum of £14,600 was listed in the Auditor-General's Report, and I cannot find where it has been listed under the Agriculture Department.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is under "Miscellaneous".

Mr. NANKIVELL: At one time I was a member of the Advisory Board of Agriculture. It is a glorious title but does not signify much because the activities of the board are restricted to the administration of the Agricultural Bureau. I have looked through the minutes of board meetings over the last few months and the business dealt with is inconsequential and not the type of business one would expect experienced farmers from all parts of the State to come together to discuss. In relation to the administration of the Agricultural Bureau, the board has a purpose. However, it has only the power to suggest to the department what should be done. Mr. Robinson, who is an excellent executive officer, is employed by the department, and everything else related to the Advisory Board is provided through a departmental grant. At one time the board actually advised the Minister and I believe this function is one that the Minister might examine. Perhaps he might be prepared to use the board to gain information about what farmers throughout the country want.

A farmer from a particular district has a good knowledge of the problems of that district. The board could draw particular matters to the attention of the Minister. Farmers could be assured that their needs were being drawn to the Minister's attention and, through the Minister, to the department's attention. Members of the Advisory Board look upon their membership as a responsible job but they find, when they have been appointed, that the board is little more than a title. I ask the Minister to see whether he can give the board some real purpose.

Line passed.

Agricultural College Department, £161,437.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: How many cadets of the Agriculture Department are at present training at Roseworthy Agricultural College?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I cannot give that information offhand but I will get it.

Line passed.

Produce Department, £287,888—passed.

Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, £58,515.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is almost a 50 per cent reduction in the sum provided for maintenance, repairs and running expenses of boats. This is a large reduction and I doubt the wisdom of economizing on the equipment provided for inspectors; I presume the reduction is a matter of economy. I had hoped that the Estimates would provide for a substantial addition in this regard.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The time has arrived when the department should have one boat capable of carrying out exploration work on the continental shelf. Although the present vessel, I think called *Investigator*, is a nice, seaworthy vessel, it is not large enough for the type of work that we will have to undertake if we are to get the full benefit from research into the tuna industry, which I think is probably the most useful activity the department can undertake. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider getting a decent-sized vessel of the type the tuna industry now has that could make some real contribution to research into the tuna industry?

Mr. HALL: I understand that the United States of America and Russia, the two greatest powers in the world, are spending much time and money on building and equipping research vessels. Also, we have read of Japanese fishing close to our continent and Russian boats fishing to the south of Australia, at times almost in South Australian waters. It is logical that, unless we do much more in research on the high seas, foreign powers will know far more of the fishing resources south of our continent than we will. We need the best and most efficient vessel we can afford.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This question has been discussed by the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation and the Harbors Board. The Director discussed with the board and with Mr. Traung, a visiting fisheries expert, the design and specifications of a new vessel. The Director had approval to go ahead on general planning.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter is being discussed constantly, and next year we hope to have finance to carry on this work. I realize there is a need for this research vessel. Much discussion took place at the conference in Brisbane about research into fisheries, and I was surprised and disappointed at the lack of interest of the Commonwealth Government. It was stressed that Mr. Traung was brought out by that Government and that he was

experienced and gave good advice, but he did not deal with research. Mr. Adermann (Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry) had difficulty in explaining this. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization was spending money on research, but much of it was not associated with fisheries. I suggested that each State should provide, say, £10,000 a year and the Commonwealth Government subsidize it on a two-for-one basis so that money would be provided for research. We discussed gear research, but that would be outside the realm of State Governments, and the Commonwealth Government would have to assist. It is a fact that vessels of foreign powers have been in our waters. This matter should be considered by the Commonwealth Government, so that the States could be provided with the knowledge they should have in this field. I appreciated going to Brisbane to this conference, and trust that it will be fruitful.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have criticized the Commonwealth Government about its research programme and I am sure that it could do more, but, in fairness, it has spent much money in South Australian waters.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I appreciate that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: From the sale of a whaling station, the Commonwealth Government provided several hundreds of thousands of pounds in buying and operating the *Southern Endeavour* trawling project in the Great Australian Bight. That was not a successful research project, because the company formed could not operate economically and lost much money. I have criticized the Commonwealth Government for not doing enough research but the fact is that that venture could have been a great success and, if it had been, we would have had no complaint. I think the Minister appreciates that the Commonwealth has done much more than it is sometimes given credit for, although I think both sides agree that it could do more.

Mr. RYAN: I support the remarks of members opposite regarding the need for a research vessel for the whole fishing industry. It is not sufficient to have a vessel suitable only for in-shore fishing when the main research has to be done out to sea from a larger vessel. The Commonwealth Government has subsidized the small ship building industry in Australia generally but has prescribed a minimum size of vessel, below which a subsidy would not be granted. Recently, two vessels which have been subsidized by the Commonwealth Government and which will be engaged solely in the tuna

industry were launched at Port Adelaide. Will the Minister ask the Commonwealth Government to subsidize this State in the building of a vessel that would be used purely for research and mainly in the tuna industry?

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the line providing for the salary of a fauna officer. Under this line, does the department intend to appoint a resident officer to look after reserves such as those in the hundreds of Spence and Woolumbool, and at Bool Lagoon? Has the Minister considered a suggestion that a permanent officer be stationed at the Bool Lagoon reserve?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Having a permanent officer in the South-East is being considered, but where he will be placed has yet to be decided. I think he should be at Bool Lagoon because of supervision and because this will be South Australia's showplace for bird life. Further discussions will be held, and the matter will be decided later.

Line passed.

Chemistry Department, £89,432.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The provision for contingencies has been reduced by £5,874. The Chemistry Department has always had to compete with larger departments for necessary equipment and apparatus. Although it has obtained a fair amount of equipment over the years, its work has increased. The department's work is important, and accuracy is necessary. Apart from carrying out post-mortems and blood tests it does work for the Agriculture Department, and even analyses swabs of racehorses and supervises explosives magazines. The Director is an extremely capable officer.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He is underpaid, too.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: He is an outstanding officer and makes the best of conditions. The reputation of his department is extremely high. Eventually it will move into better premises, and it will need better apparatus. When I was Minister in charge of the department the Director had a long list of apparatus he wanted. He was not getting what he should have got. This year there is a decrease in the proposed expenditure. Is there a reason for that or has he been caught in the general tightening up of money? It is important to know whether he will be able to carry on his work, which is expanding rather than contracting.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The main decrease occurs on the line "Purchase of motor vehicles, additions and improvements". The former Minister will recall that he equipped

the department with motor trucks. That was the purpose of the line. Now the equipment has been provided and the amount is not required. I am assured that, although there is a decrease of £1,448 on last year's amount, the department will be able to purchase necessary equipment. For total salaries and wages there is a considerable increase of £7,392. There are also increases in various items under "Contingencies". In effect, the work of this department is not decreasing. I appreciate the work of the chief executive officer.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I presume that the temporary staff includes a number of employees whose salaries were paid by the Agriculture Department. They were employed under the wheat research grant. Can the Minister say whether they have transferred their activities to the Northfield Research Centre?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall get that information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £679,159.

Mr. HEASLIP: I see that £14,637 was spent on weed destruction last year and that it is proposed to spend £24,579 this year, an increase of almost £10,000. I presume that this weed eradication is being carried out in the forests. If so, I commend the Government for the increase, because it owns a huge tract of country in the Wirrabara forest where cape tulip is rife. It is wrong that the Government, which makes the laws for the eradication of noxious weeds and owns land, does nothing about weed eradication. Private people should not be prosecuted unless the Government plays its part also. It is spraying the forest area now, as it did last year, but it is not covering the area sufficiently to eradicate the cape tulip. Will the Minister ensure that the money provided is spent in eradicating this weed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am sorry to disillusion the honourable member, but the sum provided is not for that purpose. The Woods and Forests Department has its own money for that purpose, and it is doing what the honourable member requested some time ago. The line to which the honourable member refers provides money for reimbursing councils for the work they do in eradicating weeds, and a subsidy in respect of inspectors. The worst weed we have at present is the South African daisy.

Mr. Heaslip: Is it for work on roadsides?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It refers to weeds on roads, Government and private pro-

perty. The South African daisy is spreading down through the Murray Plains—

Mr. Heaslip: Does it refer to Crown lands?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In some cases, yes. This provision is to reimburse councils for their work. Under the Weeds Act, provision is made for councils to claim reimbursement for work they undertake on Crown lands.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Treasurer explain the reduction in the grant to the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society this year from £6,000 to £5,000?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I received a deputation from the society. It asked for more money to assist in maintaining its buildings, etc., and in keeping pace with the standards required. In addition, I have ascertained that the society has to effect certain extensions, and that it will ask the Government to consider a request not for a grant but for a loan at a lower rate of interest. I agreed to provide £1,000 more this year than it received last year.

Mr. Millhouse: It is £1,000 less.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I agreed to provide out of General Revenue £1,000 more than it received last year (which, I think, was £4,000).

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It received £6,000 last year.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In that case, the provision must have covered some other matter and was not the normal sum. It received an extra £1,000 this year on the normal figure.

Mr. Heaslip: It is £1,000 down.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I received a deputation from the society earlier this year. Whatever the amount in the previous year, I agreed to give £1,000 more this year for maintenance generally. Certain other discussions have taken place since the last show. If there is a reduction it could be associated with a building fund or some other matter of which I do not know the details. However, I know that the society will get £1,000 more than last year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe the Treasurer is under some misapprehension on this matter. The society has been receiving amounts under two headings but they have been grouped together in the Budget under one heading. The amount received last year was £6,000, which comprised a grant of £2,000 under one heading and £4,000 under another heading. The £4,000 was regarded as

a grant that would be carried on from year to year. The society bought premises; the Government did not put up the capital cost but said it would probably help with the interest payments. The £2,000 was a special grant towards working expenses. Last year the society received £6,000. This year the Treasurer has repeated the allocation of £4,000 and has given the society £1,000 towards working expenses.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: A sum of £19,100 is provided for an advance to the Artificial Breeding Board, which is a decrease of £7,400 on last year's amount. Under section 18 of the Artificial Breeding Act, 1961, the Treasurer may make advances totalling £150,000 to meet the initial expenses of the board constituted under the Act in respect of the first five years of its activities, commencing with and including the financial year ended June 30, 1962. Therefore, the financial year ending June 30, 1966, will be the fifth financial year, and during five years a total of £150,000 can be made available. In the last four years, and including the sum of £19,100 proposed to be made available this financial year, the total advanced has been £127,896, which still leaves £22,104 to be made available, if necessary, by the Treasurer to meet the initial financial expenditure of the board. I raise this matter because only over the last weekend representations were made to me by primary producers in my district (particularly in the Light Pass area adjoining Nuriootpa who stated that a subcentre was established in Eden Valley in May of this year, and that at this subcentre, which deals with an artificial insemination project at Eden Valley, valuable work is being done by Mr. Fulton, who is in charge. It appears that the work being done by that subcentre cannot extend as far as the Light Pass area, which is about 11 to 12 miles distant. I was told that recently a petition from 21 farmers owning 126 cows was forwarded to the executive officer of the board (I think his name is Mr. Rose) requesting that the services of the Eden Valley subcentre be made available to them. They have been told by letter that the board is considering the requirements of the Light Pass area and also Williamstown, Nuriootpa, Tanunda, Lyndoch, and Greenock, and that it is hoped a decision will be reached between now and next March on whether a separate subcentre will be established to serve the areas or, in the alternative, whether the Light Pass area will be served by the Eden Valley subcentre.

I am informed by the primary producers in the Light Pass area that this is a matter of urgency, and they wonder whether, until a decision is reached, their herds can receive the services rendered by the Eden Valley subcentre. Will the Minister take up this matter with the board to see whether the requests of the primary producers can be considered immediately?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will look into the matter for the honourable member. Line passed.

MINISTER OF IRRIGATION.

Department of Lands (Irrigation and Drainage), £524,305.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I draw attention to the substantial alterations that have been made in setting out these accounts. The first line deals with salaries and wages, under which the amount proposed for this year is £415,525, an increase of £22,005 on last year's amount. However, when we look at last year's Estimates and try to check on the position we find that the amount voted was £44,000 and that £43,000 was spent. For 1964-65, the amount proposed was £44,000. Here we have another case where many departments have been lumped together without any explanation. I presume these amounts are recharged to other departments, but no explanation is given and the figures do not balance. Last year's payments do not compare with what the Auditor-General said they were. We had a similar problem in connection with the Minister of Works. I thank him for the report, but it will take much time to consider. For Parliament's consideration of the accounts of the various departments, continuity of setting out is necessary. This was a feature of previous Parliamentary Papers. Unless the figures are set out so that a valid comparison can be made, they are meaningless.

Will the Minister of Irrigation see that these details are not altered so drastically in future, as it is impossible to follow the accounts as presented at present? Any consideration by the Committee seems futile, as no logical comparisons can be made, and the figures cannot be balanced with previous appropriations. I protest most emphatically against these accounts being so drastically different from the previous practice. This should not be imposed on the Committee without a full and ample explanation. What is the reason for so completely altering the accounts, and why is no explanation given? It is impossible to make comparisons with what was spent last year.

We shall get to the stage presently where we are told that it is proposed under the Estimates to spend £120,000,000, without being given any detail at all.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: In all the criticism that you have put forward in this session you have not won a round yet!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My criticism is of the alteration in the method of accounting. The Minister of Works had to get a report on the matter and he has given that to me. He had not been told of the radical changes and I doubt whether the Minister of Agriculture was consulted about the changed method. The Committee is not able to compare expenditures last year with what is provided in these Estimates in relation to the various departments.

The Auditor-General has reported that the losses in the department with which we are concerned at present are heavy. Although much money has been spent on providing up-to-date equipment and although Parliament was assured at the time electrification took place that there would be a reduction in working expenses, there is still an upsurge in working expenses and the losses are excessively high. There is no information to show what account the amount of £149,000 is charged to and one has to search the whole Estimates to find out. Although £144,000 was charged last year under this account, the Estimates do not show that and the figure is only arrived at when one does some accounting in connection with last year's figures. I think the Committee would be obliged if the Minister could explain why it is necessary to change this accounting system so violently and if he could explain the best method of getting a comparison of expenditure last year with what is provided this year.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Irrigation): What the Leader says is true; I would not have a great deal of knowledge on this subject. However, he referred to the report by my colleague the Minister of Works, and I should like to read one or two paragraphs from it. The Minister said:

The revised administrative and accounting arrangement followed a special investigation and recommendation of outside consultants which was arranged and approved by the previous Government. The details of re-arranged accounting were arrived at after bringing into consultation both the Treasury officers and the officers of the Auditor-General.

The Minister also said:

This practice of attempting to show comparable figures when a re-arrangement becomes necessary is by no means new, and in fact has been done on a number of occasions by

the previous Government. It was done in the 1964-65 Estimates by the previous Administration for the Public Buildings Department. This was an extensive re-arrangement in the course of which the whole of the salaries and wages for Revenue, Loan, and other purposes was shown in the first instance and then the amounts not ultimately chargeable to Revenue were deducted. It consolidated the previous rather fragmented arrangement and it showed for information the actual gross provisions for the previous year in the new form although they were not provided in that form in the previous Budget.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was obliged to the Minister of Works for making that explanation, which related to a large sum, voted on the Estimates for wages, that was recharged to construction under the Loan programme, but is it suggested that the moneys voted here are to go to the Loan programme? I do not believe they are. The Minister of Works will remember that £4,200,000 was voted because it was hard to say at the beginning of the year which men would be working on Loan works and which men would be working on maintenance works. Is the Minister saying that the amounts charged here are being recharged to Loan Account?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: There is no suggestion of that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Then the reasons given by the Minister of Works do not apply here.

Mr. Hudson: That is not true, because they covered the whole account and not just one item.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Over £4,000,000 was to be charged to the Loan Account for the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Hudson: But there was much more to it than that, as you pointed out at the time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understood that the £4,200,000 was for capital works, but, as it was impossible to determine at the beginning of the year which men would be working on capital works, the charge was made first to the Budget and was to be recharged from Loan funds in due course. However, the position I am now discussing is not the result of a recommendation by efficiency experts; it is merely a regrouping within the department of the same amounts under different headings. The ultimate result is not very much different from the previous result except that all the accounts have been altered. I do not think this is fair to the Committee. I ask that, when the Estimates are presented next year, they shall be on a factual basis and that we shall not be told that a certain amount was

voted in the previous year for an item whereas in fact it was provided for a group of items.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It went over fairly well in your time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. If any member asked for an explanation of a provision or an alteration, it was given. As far as I can see, there is no reason for the alteration of the figures except that they have been condensed into a smaller space on the Estimates: they now occupy one page instead of two.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There seems to be no further comment from the Government on this. I support the Leader's remarks. As the Minister of Works alone has said anything about this, I too ask: how can the Committee adequately examine these accounts if they are presented in their present form? We have not been given an answer. I urge that something be done next year to ensure that they are put in such a form that we can discuss them item by item, as we have always done.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MINES.

Mines Department, £940,656.

Mr. QUIRKE: In view of the encouragement being given to prospecting, what has taken place in the old Burra copper mine area?

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It may be rather interesting to know.

Mr. QUIRKE: It may be. I do not want the Minister to disclose anything that he does not wish to but, as much testing has been done around the Burra copper mine area, a large amount of money must have been spent there. The work is still progressing. Can the Minister give the Committee any account of the results of the boring in the Burra area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Lands): At this stage I cannot give the honourable member the information he desires. Experiments are taking place in that area and in other areas of the State. The old mine at Kanmantoo is being explored. There was a rich area around Burra and, if it can be exploited, I am sure it will be.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The item "Contingencies—Expenses of natural gas pipeline feasibility study—£20,000" is, of course, a new line and obviously refers to the arrangements entered into by the Government with the consultants. I presume their work and research and the production of a report is covered by this line. Is £20,000 a contract price for the seismic report; is it a payment on account; or is it the sum in round figures expected to cover the cost of this study?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This sum relates to provision for consultants engaged to investigate the feasibility of a natural gas main, but I shall ascertain for the honourable member whether it is the full payment in that regard or the contract price.

Mr. HALL: In regard to geological and geophysical survey £204,303 was spent last year, and £154,600 is voted for this year—a reduction of nearly £50,000, or 25 per cent, on last year's figures. This may be the result of a change of policy, but I point out that a need exists for these types of survey. In fact, I understood that seismic surveys and investigations into possible oil-drilling sites in the Innamincka area in the North-East of the State and the State's general mineral research were going ahead in full swing. Will the Minister explain this reduction?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My information relates to travelling and other expenses incurred in undertaking surveys of the mineral resources of the State, including the continuing of seismic surveys in northern areas, involving one party, a survey in the Mount Davies and Musgrave Park areas, printing geological survey bulletins and other expenditure. I am not sure about the details of the sum spent last year or whether the same requirements exist this year.

Mr. HEASLIP: In regard to test boring in undeveloped areas, conservation of underground water, stores, on-charges, motor vehicle expenses, etc., a £675 decrease is provided for this year. The exploration of water resources in South Australia is all-important. Just north of Orroroo an artesian basin exists, where 20 years ago about 40 dairying families made a living, assisted by an irrigated water supply from the Pekina reservoir. When that supply silted up those people naturally drifted away, but after certain boring was undertaken, artesian water was obtained at about 350ft. Unfortunately, fine sand blocks the water supply. The Government has made water available to the township of Orroroo by boring, being fortunate enough to find one bore where sand did not exist.

In the northern areas the sand problem continues in irrigation. One settler sank a bore 750ft. and finished in rock with no sand problem. However, to bore to that depth requires much capital, which most of these people do not have. I was given to understand by the Mines Department about six months ago that money would be made available from the Commonwealth Government which the department was prepared to spend in this area

in sinking deep bores and ascertaining whether water was available. I do not know whether that money has been made available. If it has, I should like to know whether it will be spent in this area. If it has not been made available I should like to see other money spent in the area on an investigation into the availability of water because where 40 families once lived about 20 years ago only 15 families remain. However, with adequate water this number could be greatly increased.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member has referred to a specific matter and I will refer it to the Minister of Mines.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Provision is made for a petroleum engineer, mineral development engineer, technical information officer and pipeline engineer. The expenditure last year was £6,571 and about £11,000 is provided this year. Last year the Government approved the appointment of a technical officer to advise on possible gas supplies. Will the Minister say what is the policy behind appointing a staff for which, at present, there does not appear to be any active work?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: A pipeline engineer has been appointed. I know that his name is Mr. Causby, but I could not tell the Leader just what his duties are. I will obtain that information for the Leader.

Mr. HUDSON: In trying to make a comparison over the last few years I discovered that in the Estimates for 1963-64 the amount proposed for the Mines Department was £741,000, whereas in the Estimates for 1964-65 the amount shown as having been voted in 1963-64 was £812,400. There seems to be a discrepancy as between those two years, and presumably some change in accounting procedure took place at that time. Can the Minister obtain any information on what changes took place as between those two years and whether or not Parliament was informed about them at the time?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I again draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the accounts have been completely altered and lumped together. For instance, the amount for salaries last year under the "General" vote was £88,000, but here all the salaries are lumped together. In these Estimates we see that the vote for salaries and wages last year was £424,000, but there was no such heading in last year's Estimates. The Mining Branch, the Geological and Geophysical Survey Section,

and the Drilling and Mechanical Engineering Branch each had salaries voted to it. Not only are all these salaries lumped together this year, but the Estimates are set out to give the impression that they were not lumped together last year. Today we have a totally different form of Estimates from those prepared and submitted to Parliament last year. I do not know the reason. There is no suggestion that anything was to be transferred to Loan, which I believe to be a valid excuse in the case of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which was doing a great deal of Loan work at the same time as maintenance work. However, so far as I can see there is no valid reason for lumping the figures together in this department. Can the Minister explain this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the Leader has pointed out, it seems to involve not only this department but to be the overall policy. I will have the matter discussed in Cabinet and ascertain the position.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF MARINE.

Harbors Board Department, £1,793,897.—
passed.

Miscellaneous, £4,000.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A serious erosion problem exists in certain areas. Beach erosion is concerned with whether the sand remains on beaches at, say Henley, Grange or Glenelg, but there is an extremely serious erosion of the headland at Christies Beach. If this is not checked the road will gradually disappear and the houses on the esplanade will be in danger. The erosion problem has been fully investigated, and it is clear that enormous sums are required to resist erosion, and this is far beyond councils' resources.

In the past, the problem has been dealt with by grants and by the councils' own efforts. Some work has been effective but other work has collapsed with the advent of a further storm. The Noarlunga council has an able engineer from, I think, the Highways Department, and he has prepared a comprehensive plan to deal with this problem. However, it will cost a tremendous sum, and the council does not have the resources to implement it. The Harbors Board will not accept responsibility entirely, nor will the council. I am sure the Minister is sympathetic in respect of this problem, and will understand that the people who have it at their front door, so to speak, are the district councils. I visited the area with the Minister of Mines some time ago, and the problem is so pressing that I

ask the Minister of Marine if he will, without committing himself, come with me to the area so that he can know what is happening along the seafront. That seafront is more important than many other parts of the coast because of the capital invested, and the relocating of the road and the knocking down of portion of the cliff would involve much money in acquisition. The matter might be more easily dealt with in the present situation. However, it is the biggest single problem facing the District Council of Noarlunga.

Mr. HALL: An area of beach just north of Port Gawler in my district is being eroded. Although the beach is not as important as that referred to by the honourable member for Alexandra, the area contains a good deposit of shellgrit and this has been extensively worked for many years. I consider that some method could be evolved to regulate the type of mining that is causing the erosion. I know that the member for Gawler has a constituent who is almost fanatically interested in this problem. The gentleman concerned is well-meaning and has used the beach for many years.

The shellgrit deposits have been worked, under mining leases, to the water's edge, so to speak, and the beach has been destroyed. As a result of water coming in, man-made creeks have followed the depressions resulting from the mining operations and access to camping areas is not available. Mining is continuing and although new leases contain provisions to safeguard the foreshore, I understand that the old type of lease allows the company to go as far as it likes, or to the high-water mark. I suggest to the Minister that the foreshore committee or waterways committee investigate this problem.

Some responsibility in this matter may rest with the Mines Department and perhaps some arrangement could be worked out by Mines Department officers and the people working the leases so that a certain area of foreshore might be left, not of great width but sufficient to prevent the inroads of the sea. The water comes in when the shellgrit banks are taken to high-water mark. If it breaks in much further, a sizeable area behind the shellgrit dunes will be inundated. In the shellgrit areas there are untidy workings 6ft. or 8ft. deep, and there is an area of beach and foreshore that could have provided valuable camping facilities in the future. I regret that the beach has been destroyed and that the need for its conservation has not been seen earlier. However, that does not mean that some action cannot be taken. I suggest that the Mines

Department consider the matter and, even if it has no power to prevent the working of leases, perhaps it can get these people to do something to prevent inundation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I agree that the problem mentioned by the honourable member is important, but I think metropolitan beaches are just as important and present probably a more urgent problem. We take them for granted and forget what a priceless asset they are. Until recent years we have had a great stretch of sand right along the coastline, and this is something we cannot afford to lose. I hope that the £3,000 provided will be sufficient to start this research because, if we lose our beaches, we shall have lost one of our greatest and most attractive assets, and this must not happen. I congratulate the Government on providing for this research, and I hope it will be encouraged to make as much money available within reason as is necessary to conduct necessary research into the preservation of our beaches.

Mr. CLARK: I support the remarks of the member for Gouger. Port Gawler is a popular beach that has been spoiled by man. Several people from Gawler have complained about what almost amounts to the desecration of this beach, and I have referred them to the member for Gouger, who is the member for the district. There is great interest in Gawler in this matter, as ever since my boyhood many people from that town have been taking their children to Port Gawler for holidays. At least, they used to do so, but this beach has been almost completely spoiled. I agree with the honourable member in asking that something be done even at this late stage to prevent its complete destruction.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine): I hope the Committee has not a wrong impression about this line. The member for Mitcham stated the position clearly when he said it was the first time there had been a line for this research into erosion. I think that £3,000 is a very small amount considering the serious damage caused by beach erosion.

Mr. Clark: It is not beach erosion at Port Gawler; it is man-made.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate that. I note what the members for Gouger and Gawler have said. I will take up this matter with the General Manager of the Harbors Board to see whether prompt action cannot be taken in that area. It is a crying shame that a beach should be destroyed by the actions of man. It is bad enough when a beach is destroyed by natural causes. I

appreciate what the member for Alexandra has said. What I can do I do not know. I looked at some other beaches not long ago, where the erosion was not as obvious as it might be in this area; but it was still just as serious. If that is the position, an improvement is necessary. This research is a beginning. I hope that, through it, we shall be able to assist people with know-how, and that the Government may later be able to help financially those people in real difficulties.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is this money being paid to the university? A proposition was put up to the Government some years ago whereby it would pay a certain amount of money for beach research for an officer of the university to draw up a programme, some of that money to be subsidized by local government. If this is that scheme, I point out to the Minister that this afternoon we voted over £5,000,000 to the university. I believe it should undertake some of this type of investigation without coming to the Government and asking for further money, particularly a small sum like this. Surely the university, having got a subvention of £5,000,000 from the Government, could well have undertaken this small amount of research for the beaches committee without charging it to the Government?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assume that the money does go to the university, but I will get a full report.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I doubt whether the university is putting anything into it, because I know the district councils have made a contribution. I believe the District Council of Noarlunga has agreed to pay £500 towards this investigation. No doubt that is part of the contribution being made by all seaside councils. I doubt whether the university is contributing anything at all.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: To save any further confusion, I shall obtain a detailed report.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF TRANSPORT.

Minister of Transport Department, £8,933—
passed.

Railways Department, £15,294,655.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am pleased to see that the form of the Estimates under this line follows precisely the form of last year's Estimates. They are easy to follow and do not present half the difficulties we have had with other departments. I commend the Railways Commissioner for his strict accounting methods, and particularly for his effective con-

trol of expenditure. A saving of about £18,000 is effected in respect of office expenses, stores, supplies, etc., in one direction, and a further saving of over £17,000 in another direction. These are items that could easily lead to increased expenditure. In respect of fuel for motive power, a reduction of about £34,000 is effected this year. This line has been reduced year after year. Is it because of reduced fuel prices, less fuel used, or is it expected that less freight will be handled this year? The Treasurer has often said he wants a steep rise in railway earnings, but that seems incompatible with the substantial continued drop in the quantity of fuel purchased by the railways.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I shall ask the Minister of Transport to convey the congratulations to the Commissioner because this is the first occasion on which any commendation has come from the Leader during the discussion on the Estimates.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I should be pleased if you would pass on my congratulations.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall do so. The decrease of £34,235 is the result of a reduction in the price of fuel, improved efficiency, and the introduction of additional diesel-electric locomotives. The market for oil is fairly competitive, and I have no doubt the Railways Commissioner is alive to that fact. I would be surprised if there has been a reduction in the carriage of freight, because from reports given to Cabinet I know that the Minister has been attempting all along to improve the position wherever possible.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Auditor-General's Report shows a deficiency of about £900,000 in running expenses of the railways. The Government has made announcements about the co-ordination of transport and an expected increase in earnings of about £1,000,000. Will the Treasurer indicate what is proposed by the co-ordination of transport and how his Government expects to increase railway revenue by £1,000,000?

Mr. HALL: Several months ago I had occasion to purchase some interstate rail tickets. The cost was about £30, and I found that a cheque was not acceptable at the railways ticket office. This is not the fault of the present Government, as it has been departmental policy for a long time. I think it is an absolutely absurd policy. I have seen the honourable member for Mitcham walk into an airlines office, buy a ticket, sign a cheque almost on the run, and then immediately board an aeroplane. He was not under suspicion

by the people in the airlines office. In the purchase of interstate rail tickets a cheque will not be accepted, yet cheques are accepted by interstate airline people. Is this class discrimination? Why is it good enough for an airline passenger but not a train passenger? Allowing people to pay by cheque would be one small but important way for the railways to attract business. I do not advocate the acceptance of cheques for local travel, where comparatively small amounts are involved. More and more people are using cheque accounts, for it is not always convenient to carry large amounts of cash.

Mr. RODDA: I noticed in the press at the weekend that about 130 migrants would be coming to this country and that many would be employed in the Railways Department. In the South-East (as I suppose is the case in other parts of the State) railway tracks need maintenance. One or two derailments have occurred with diesels hauling large loads. It is important, more especially if we are to increase rail freights, that the tracks be in satisfactory working order. Can the Treasurer say how many of the newcomers will be employed on railway track maintenance?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In reply to the member for Ridley, in all good time we hope to have ready the necessary legislation associated with our policy on transport control. I remind the honourable member for Gouger that only a few weeks ago the honourable member for Alexandra raised the question of the non-acceptance of cheques by the Railways Department. The answer then was that if the person tendering a cheque were known, or could be vouched for, the officer in charge of the interstate booking office would accept the cheque. In answer to the member for Victoria, there is no information at this stage about how many of the migrants will be engaged on railway maintenance work. It is hoped that we will get a good number.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed at the reply about cheques. The Treasurer has merely endorsed the present practice of the Railways Department, which is a prime example of conservative business practice. If the department wants to be up to date, it cannot afford to treat cheques with suspicion. The Government said that it would appoint a Minister of Transport who would co-ordinate buses and trams and other means of transport. However, there has not been the slightest change. The same replies to questions are received, and they are merely transmissions of the views of the Railways Commissioner.

On several occasions I have asked the Treasurer whether it would be possible to grant free rail travel to ex-employees of the Railways Department, a suggestion that one would expect a Government of this political complexion to treat with sympathy. The answer was a report from the Railways Commissioner on what happens at present. I then put the question on notice and was informed that former departmental heads of seven years' standing received free travel after their retirement. I asked whether the Government was prepared to grant the privilege to all retired employees. I did not get an answer about what the Government was prepared to do, but I got a considered reply commencing, "The Railways Commissioner reports". We have the new title of Minister of Transport, but not a thing more than we had before. This Government does not even pretend to decide policy on these matters: all it does is to transmit without note or comment the views of the Railways Commissioner. I do not know why the Minister is not prepared to exercise the authority that one would think his title gives him. I say again on this particular matter that I am disappointed and surprised that the Government is not prepared to give free travel to former railway employees, perhaps after they have attained certain standing, but is simply prepared to sell them down the river and accept the former practice explained by the Railways Commissioner.

Mr. HALL: I am very dissatisfied with the answer given by the Treasurer to the question whether he would ask the Railways Commissioner to accept cheques without the necessary formalities being demanded at present. The Treasurer referred me to the question asked by the honourable member for Alexandra and the honourable member gave me a copy of this question and answer while the Treasurer was speaking. The answer commenced in a way with which we are all familiar, saying: "The Railways Commissioner reports". I have had these replies for years, not only from the present administration. However, the reply went on:

The interstate booking office does accept cheques under the following conditions:

- (a) That the customer has authorized credit with the department.
- (b) That the customer is known personally to the booking clerk as being of good reputation.
- (c) That the customer is able to name an officer in the railways who is prepared to vouch for him.
- (d) In the absence of any of the above conditions, when there is sufficient time available before date of travel (seven

days for a South Australian cheque and 14 days for an interstate cheque) for the cheque to be cleared.

To many people who have to make business trips and want to travel quickly, this restriction prevents the use of cheques. If the people for whom I have purchased tickets had known that we would have to go to the trouble of leaving the interstate booking office, going up the street, cashing a cheque there and coming back again, they would not have travelled by rail, and because of this inconvenience they probably will not travel by rail again. One other reason given was:

Although some transport instrumentalities may accept cheques without restriction, and take the chance of cheques being dishonoured, in the interests of goodwill, the Railways being a Government department would not be able to accept this risk because of audit regulations.

This refers particularly to the interstate booking office.

I know that Trans-Australia Airlines is not a Government department in the same sense as the South Australian Railways is, but surely Government finance is behind T.A.A. just as it is behind the S.A.R. The comparison made will not support the argument that cheques cannot be accepted because of the possible loss. If it is bad business for the airline companies to accept cheques and if they are losing money over it, you can bet your boots that they will discontinue the practice. We cannot say that Mr. Ansett is inefficient, whatever else honourable members may think of him.

The ability of a person to walk into an office at an airport, buy a ticket and catch a plane is a great convenience and similar facilities should be extended to persons who travel by train. It could well be that the banks had closed when a person wanted to buy a ticket. It might be 4 p.m. when a person wanted a ticket to enable him to board the Overland and if he did not have the cash, he could not purchase the ticket, although he might have a cheque account with thousands of pounds in it. This is bad business. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) has not received an opinion from the Treasurer; he has received only a report from the Railways Commissioner. Today I asked for an opinion, but again the Treasurer gave this report. I should like him to intervene and not just give a reply provided by the Commissioner.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner has control over railway administration, although soon there will be an opportunity for members to consider whether he should be under the control of the Minister.

Even if he is under Ministerial control, however, I will not argue with the Auditor-General if he says that he cannot sanction payments by cheque. The Railways Commissioner has been presenting reports to Parliament for years, and it has been suggested that I compliment him, which I shall do.

Mr. CURREN: Most of the produce processed at the Riverland cannery is handled on pallets, and I have had discussions with the manager about the need for rolling stock so that goods on pallets can be loaded straight on to trucks and be unloaded at their destination by forklift trucks. This will save the company handling costs at both ends. About 90 per cent of the pack is transported by rail, and if this method is used a greater percentage can be handled in this way. The member for Rocky River dealt with railways in the Budget debate. He implied that most of the railway revenue was derived from country sources. The passage bears quoting:

It is interesting to note in the Auditor-General's Report whence the Railways Department gets its revenue. It is from country and suburban passengers, parcels, mail, etc., general merchandise and miscellaneous freight, wool, wheat, barley and other grains, livestock, minerals, rents and miscellaneous, refreshment services and bookstalls—a total of £14,900,000. The only item that is metropolitan in that list is "suburban passengers", who contributed only £858,000 out of a total of £14,900,000.

That is rather a misleading statement about the source of revenue of the South Australian Railways. I checked the matter with the Minister of Transport. The revenue from interstate freights and passengers amounts to £7,000,000. That is entirely different from what was told us by the member for Rocky River. The figure for freight from that interstate business is £6,198,259, of which the ore traffic from the Broken Hill mines to Port Pirie accounts for £2,836,000. The interstate passenger revenue is £667,076. The member for Rocky River definitely misrepresented the situation; it was a deliberate attempt to mislead the people of this State. I commend for the Minister's consideration the points I have made and hope that the Minister of Transport will be able to do something in the near future.

Mr. HALL: I have not yet received an answer to my question. The Treasurer's answer to the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) left the decision to the Railways Commissioner. When I protested about this, he said that the Railways Commissioner was all-powerful in this matter; but he went on to say that even if, as Treasurer, he did have the power to make recommendations about

this (and he indicated that he might well be in the position, as Premier, to give such directions), he would not do so if the Auditor-General did not approve. That is putting the responsibility on to the shoulders of the Auditor-General. This still does not give me an answer. This decision is important, but many others are equally so. Surely we shall not put the business of government into the hands of the Auditor-General?

Mr. Millhouse: It is wrong that the Government should hide behind him.

Mr. HALL: He is not there for the Government to hide behind; nor is he there to create policy. Once again I ask, even at the risk of getting an outright refusal: is it not putting the decision on to someone else. If the Treasurer does not agree with this, we should be told. If he does agree with it, he can take steps, certainly under the revised administration he envisages for the future, to correct the position.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some years ago it was suggested that it would be advantageous to the Railways Department to allow the Tourist Bureau and interstate travel agencies to sell railway tickets to interstate travellers, similarly to the way in which airways tickets are sold, on a commission basis. At the time, the Railways Commissioner opposed that suggestion, but I believe that almost all Railways Departments in the other States have now adopted this arrangement. Will the Treasurer take the matter up with the Commissioner?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, in reply to the member for Chaffey, if it is possible to use the fork-lift and pallet method of unloading goods, I hope that it will be implemented (if it is not already in use). Secondly, I am prepared to request my colleague, the Minister of Transport, to investigate the possibility of selling tickets through the Tourist Bureau, as has been suggested. I intimated earlier that certain legislation in respect of the Railways Commissioner's being responsible to a Minister would be introduced. How can I compliment the Commissioner on the one hand and say something else the next minute? When I refer to railways in this place I am challenged merely because I give a verbatim report of what the Railways Commissioner has said, and he is the person responsible for administering railways in this State. Let any member challenge that here or elsewhere.

Mr. Millhouse: There used to be a Minister of Railways.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the past the Minister of Railways could make repre-

sentations to the Railways Commissioner about matters raised from time to time in Parliament. If the Minister considered that these matters were to the advantage of railways administration he would undoubtedly refer them to the Commissioner. On the other hand, if the Commissioner considered they were not in the best interests of his administration I am sure that he would refuse to take action. This has been the practice in this State over many years. Honourable members have been anxious to have reforms made in six months in respect of conditions which have applied for as long as I have been a member of this place. I will convey congratulations to the Commissioner, through the Minister of Transport, as requested by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I referred to the Kapunda-Freeling-Adelaide line and, in particular, to the service provided from Eudunda to Adelaide each morning and back again each evening. I said that I knew that the Chief Mechanical Engineer intended to build a new type of rolling stock for this service based on the design of the 400-type railcar now used on suburban services. For the country service the Chief Mechanical Engineer envisaged the provision of toilets, increased luggage accommodation, and so on. I sought to stress that what was needed in the new cars was the provision of air-conditioning. The Chief Mechanical Engineer has the responsibility for the design of this type of car. Will the Treasurer ascertain whether the Chief Mechanical Engineer has considered the suggestions I made during the Loan Estimates debate and whether he will soon be in a position to publicize the final design of this new type of car?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If it is possible to obtain information on this matter I shall do so.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thank the Treasurer for the explanation he gave earlier. Everyone agrees that the Railways Commissioner is clothed with very wide powers. The replies the Treasurer has given hinted that the Commissioner's reports are perfectly in order and according to his powers, and nobody disputes that. The Treasurer went on to say that if we wanted these powers curtailed there would be an opportunity later on this session for that to be considered. With great respect, I do not think the mere fact that the Commissioner does not accede to every request made to him is a good and sufficient reason for altering the Act to take all his powers of

administration from him, and if the Treasurer is building up a case based on comments made in this debate regarding the Commissioner's powers in order to say, "Well, it justifies a rather drastic alteration to the Act," then I do not agree with him. I say that now rather than some time later when this matter may be before us. In my experience, the Railways Commissioner is not completely without reason in these matters. I can recall many cases in my Cabinet experience where the Government desired the Commissioner to take certain action which it was entirely within his own powers to accept or reject. If a reasonable proposition is put to the Commissioner and he knows that it is the Government's wish that he should take certain action, in nine cases out of 10 he will take that action; and, if he declines to take that action, he is always able to furnish the best possible reasons. I believe that the Treasurer, with his powers of persuasion, will exercise his good offices with the Commissioner personally, that a little matter like this could easily be overcome, and that the Commissioner could alter his regulations in so far as it is necessary to bring his practices into line with normal commercial practice. In those circumstances everybody would be perfectly happy.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Honourable members must not get the idea that we want to cut the ground entirely from the Commissioner's administration. Legislation for a Minister of the Crown to be responsible to Parliament for the Railways Commissioner's administration will come before us later.

Mr. Casey: It should have been done years ago.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I consider that we have enough to do without wanting to take action to see that every ticket is punched correctly. If the Railways Commissioner had been approached by the Government, in most cases he would have given a decision favourable to the Government through the Minister responsible, but undoubtedly he would have good reasons for not implementing it. If the Government of the day prevailed on the Railways Commissioner to do something that he did not desire to do at any time, and it was the wish of the Government that he do such a thing, he probably would have acceded to it. The explanation of these Estimates contain the information that has been prepared by the Railways Commissioner and submitted to the Minister.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not question that.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take up the questions of tourists, cheques, and other matters with the Railways Commissioner.

Mr. HALL: Last year £10,000 was voted for the subsidy for the Elizabeth feeder bus service, and £3,647 was spent. This year £10,000 is proposed. This service operated by Tramway Services Proprietary Limited, is centred in the district of the member for Gawler, but also carries secondary schoolchildren from Para Hills to the Salisbury and Elizabeth high schools, and provides bus services for the general public. Apparently it has been indicated to the Government that more will be needed this year than the amount needed last year. Can the Treasurer say why the subsidy has been increased over the amount spent last year? Does it result from increased bus services? Is it for more buses or is it to meet rising costs?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The sum of £10,000 was provided for 1964-65 and £3,647 was spent. That means that the amount will be increased on this occasion by £6,353 and that provision will be made for a full subsidy of £10,000 in a whole year.

Line passed.

Transport Control Board, £22,957—passed.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £1,143,390—resumed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer the Minister to page 53 of the Auditor-General's Report, where the net weekly cost for each child at the various institutions is set out. It will be seen that the average number in residence at the Struan Farm School is only 20 and that the cost a week for each child in 1964-65 was £26 14s. 11d., whereas the figure for the previous year was £21 11s. 1d.

I notice that in the Estimates this year, where the amounts are grouped, the provision is practically a continuation of the previous vote. However, I suggest to the Minister that there is no case for continuing this institution at the cost that is involved here. This is not a criticism of the Government or of the Minister. The home was established in the first place in the hope that we would be able to give a better class of training, that we would be able to segregate some boys who at that time were congregated at the reformatory at Magill, and that we would be able to give farm training. However, I must admit that the result has not been satisfactory and I venture to suggest that

we might also look at the net cost in respect of some other institutions. This cost takes into account the value of goods produced. Campbell House is another example of an expensive institution that cannot be justified on economic grounds. I suggest to the Minister that he take steps to find out why these high costs are involved and whether the continuance of the institutions is justified. There is a wide variation between costs in the various institutions. For instance, a cottage home at Port Pirie has a cost of £8 1s. a week for each child.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There are only three children in that home, and if the number is increased there must be greater accommodation in proportion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know the reason for the variation, but perhaps the Minister will consider that aspect. For Bedford Park, two amounts are provided. The Minister said that it would be closing, but I assumed that it had closed. Will he examine the whole set-up at Struan Farm to see whether there is any justification for keeping it open at such an exorbitant cost?

Mr. RODDA: As I live virtually alongside Struan Farm School I have some knowledge of the position. It is a substantial property, and it is alarming that its running costs are so high. The Superintendent (Mr. Giles) has substantially developed the area, and I think that when the Minister makes his visit he will see that much capital improvement has been made to the property to make it more efficient. Once the full effect of this capital improvement is felt costs will go down. I believe the place can accommodate more boys, but no doubt the Minister will consider that matter. Plant has been purchased, and perhaps he will consider whether it can be run more efficiently. They have engaged a Mr. White, who gives the boys first-class instruction in gardening. I think they sold about 15 tons of potatoes and a similar amount of onions to various public stores, and they produced a large quantity of vegetables which they sold to institutions and other places near Naracoorte. They also run a flock of 1,400 sheep and are taking steps to increase this number. About 400 acres of scrub land is being cleared progressively each year, and some worthwhile afforestation has been done. Generally, there is a progressive outlook in the running of the place, but the essential thing is to look after boys. It is probably not fulfilling the purpose for which it was designed. I know that the Minister will look at that carefully when he visits Struan. I cannot justify this high cost but pay a tribute to the staff,

which is doing a good job, as I see it. However, when one looks at the figures one realizes that this matter must be seriously considered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader has already referred to Bedford Park, and it is obvious that it will be closing because the university is opening. Can the Minister say when it will close and what will happen to the boys and girls there; and, in particular, what is proposed for the members of the staff who have been at Bedford Park for some years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Social Welfare): I agree that for a long time the costs at Struan have been high. I have asked for a report from the department on its effectiveness: that is, I have asked for a report on the present employment of boys who have left Struan in the last five years, because on that will depend whether we are justified in continuing with an expenditure of this kind. As the Deputy Leader has said, it was certainly found with Campbell House that the expenditure there was not justified. I do not think that one of the boys who was at Campbell House is at present in a rural occupation. It seems that we must have a complete review of the situation at Struan. I have already moved for this in the department.

It is true that costs of other institutions mentioned by the Leader are fairly high. Apart from Struan, the highest is Stuart House at North Adelaide, but it will be noted that the cost per child has decreased significantly. That is a most useful institution; it is doing good work. It may be that we can slightly reduce the costs there. The only other institution with a remarkably high cost is the boys' training school at Magill. Here, we have an institution where we have to provide a high proportion of staff to numbers of boys. For instance, in the security block there is a high proportion of staff to inmates at times, and it is inevitable that that should be so. There is an unusually high cost at Magill, as compared with costs at other institutions. However, generally speaking, the institutions are doing a good job for the costs involved. Some of the cottage homes are a little understaffed at the moment, and the cost for each child may increase a little. I do not know whether the Leader has inspected the work in these homes, but it has been found that the cost of keeping children in cottage homes is probably a little lower than it is for larger institutions. Certainly, the effect on emotionally disturbed children of being in a cottage home, as compared with the effect on children in a larger institution, is better. A much

better result is obtained where children are, in effect, members of a family group. It has been found that cottage home development is wise, and we hope to increase that development, because it gives a lower cost and, for the most part, a better effect on the child. Children react extremely well to this type of environment. In regard to the matter raised by the member for Mitcham, the exact date when staff will be absorbed into other institutions is not known at the moment. We are understaffed in almost every institution at the moment. As to where the boys will be accommodated, some will go to open homes elsewhere, and some to closed institutions, depending on their background. We have investigated obtaining premises elsewhere, where we could run exactly the same kind of institution as is run at Bedford Park at the moment. We do not have a comparable institution at present. Unfortunately, there was an adverse report by the Land Board on the property for which we were negotiating and we did not spend money to acquire it. Some alternative proposals have been put to us regarding properties at the moment owned by the Government. We are investigating them, so a substantial part of the existing institution may be transferred elsewhere.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand the Windana Home at Glandore is a remand home for children, the remand period being three weeks. It has been brought to my attention that in one case a boy has been remanded three times. I know that classrooms exist at the home, but I believe that no provision has yet been made for the education of children. I do not know whether the matter of education at the home is under the direct control of the Attorney-General, but will he ascertain whether teaching provision can be made at the home?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter has been under investigation and has caused us some concern. The Minister of Education and I have had conversations about it. The Education Department was notified last year that Windana would be opening some time this year. In fact, it opened in June, and the department was then notified that staff was needed. The staff needed for education at Windana has to be specialized, because it is simply not possible to conduct normal classes in an institution of this kind. The children are under surveillance, and some of them are there for two or three days, some for a fortnight, some for three weeks, and some may have two or three remands. Therefore, it is not possible to provide any continuity. Their ages differ widely;

at times there are small groups of girls and much larger groups of boys, and it is necessary to have a specialized education course provided so that each child will be coped with as it comes and goes from the institution. This is not at all easy. The Director of Education has now recommended that a head teacher and two other teachers be appointed to the institution, and we hope to have it staffed educationally shortly.

Mr. CUMBE: Colton Cottage in Thorngate Street in my district was established in only February this year. Has the Minister any knowledge of its operation? Is it fulfilling the function for which it was designed? If the Minister does not have the information now (it may be under the provision dealing with cottage homes) will he obtain it for me?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Colton Cottage is one of the cottage homes in the metropolitan area and is dealt with in the provision for cottage homes. Colton Cottage operated for only part of 1964-65, and the provision covers the normal operational expenditure of all six cottages for the full year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that the Minister, like all other members, appreciates the work done by foster parents. I noticed in the Auditor-General's Report that a singularly small increase has been made in amounts paid to foster parents. Although the provision for the administration of that branch has been increased by £12,000, the amount paid to foster parents has been increased by only £3,000. It is some years since an adjustment was made in the rate paid to foster parents for the maintenance of children. Will the Minister have an examination conducted to see whether the amount is adequate or whether there should be an increase to meet the additional costs that are incurred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: People in my district with large families have needed housekeeping services at certain times, and this service has been a most valuable one. One problem seems to be that there are insufficient housekeepers to meet the demand, and it has been necessary in the past to book several months in advance to secure this service. Can the Minister say whether it has been possible to maintain the present complement of housekeepers, and whether this service can be increased to meet what could be an increasing demand?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the figures at the moment so I am unable to answer the honourable member's question. I will get the information for him.

Mr. HUDSON: I notice that no amount is proposed this year under the line "Alcohol and drug addicts treatment". I understand that the board has had its first meeting and that it is functioning. I presume this vote has been transferred to some other part of the Estimates. Regarding the establishment of a treatment centre, the query that arises is whether or not we know sufficient at present about the way in which alcoholics need to be treated to be able to design a centre. It may be better in the next year or two to try to expand the extent to which alcoholics are treated at a particular centre so that greater experimentation can take place and greater knowledge can be gained of the kind of approach needed. Can the Minister give me any information on these two questions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board will now come under the Minister of Health. This board was committed to the administration of the Minister of Social Welfare when that portfolio was created. Investigation then took place as to the best way to proceed. The board consisted of the previous Comptroller of Gaols and Prisons and a representative of the Health Department, and in between the custodial view on the board and the medical view on the board there was the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board holding the balance. The Government, after investigation, takes the view that basically the treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts is a medical problem, that alcoholism is a disease and that it is not mainly a custodial problem, although it is partly a custodial problem. We came to the conclusion that it was inappropriate to have the treatment centre associated with the Yatala Labour Prison or in that immediate area. It had been intended to proceed this year with the erection of a treatment centre there but, upon further investigation, the Government concluded that this was not the appropriate way to proceed. The Public Works Committee had reported strongly against that project, and we considered that the people involved in this work should be doctors and medical people and it should therefore come under the Minister of Health.

There was also a proposal that we open a voluntary centre for treatment of alcoholics at the Magill Home, but as Minister of Social Welfare I considered that this was an entirely inappropriate place as I did not want my department involved in that way with the treatment of alcoholics. The centre, when

established, should be established in conjunction with facilities that already exist in the northern part of the metropolitan area under the Minister of Health. That is how the matter is proceeding. I believe it will be essential to provide a treatment centre quickly, as it has been long delayed. In the meantime we have the ghastly procession daily in the courts of summary jurisdiction of people with many convictions who are not getting the custodial and medical treatment they need. Taking them to the Adelaide Gaol seems both cruel and inadvisable, and the sooner we can proceed with our plans the better. The board is endeavouring to introduce a new proposal for a treatment centre soon.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £110,625.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I notice that there is no significant increase in the grant to the Law Society of South Australia for legal assistance to poor persons, and that disappoints me. I refer the Attorney-General to the annual report of the Law Society for the past year, particularly to one paragraph in the report of the retiring president, Mr. McEwin, where he said:

In particular, the whole question of legal assistance is one likely to receive close re-examination in the near future in the light of modern developments in England and other places, and it is hoped in due course with possibly some Commonwealth support, a legal assistance scheme will be able to function in a much more satisfactory and just manner from the point of view of the profession, which has, over so many years, given the scheme such faithful support at considerable personal sacrifice.

The extent of that sacrifice is illustrated in the report which states that in the distribution of the Government funds for the half year ended December 31, 1963, the differential dividend (that is, the proportion of the full amount of the charge) was 6s. 8d. in the pound for criminal matters and 4s. 8d. in the pound for all other matters. For the half year ended June 30, 1964, it was 6s. and 3s. 8d. and for the half year ended December 31, 1964, it was 5s. and 3s. 2d. That shows that the legal profession is doing a large volume of work for little remuneration indeed and although I say it as a member of the profession, it is a matter for regret that the profession should have to bear it. Even if there is no significant increase in this line, I should like to hear from the Attorney on the plans he has in this regard.

I should also like information on the provision "Payments in fidelity bonds—Land Agents Act" for which £8,000 is provided.

Is one person involved, or a number, or what is the position? The Attorney-General mentioned the consolidation of the South Australian Statutes the other day when discussing the position of Mr. Cartledge and I think he said that some arrangement had been made between Mr. Cartledge and the Law Book Company about it. I wonder how thorough the consolidation is going to be. We have not had a consolidation since 1936, when it was a sort of centenary present by the Government. Will it be a consolidation of that nature, as I hope it will? I am glad to see the nod from the Attorney-General. I should also like to know when it is likely to be completed.

The last matter I raise is in regard to the item "National Fitness Council of South Australia" for which £20,000 is provided, with a further £25,000 for training youth leaders and subsidizing the establishment of youth clubs. These are large new items, involving £45,000.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are not new; they are simply transferred from the Minister of Education.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is this the same amount as has been paid before?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Attorney could answer my other queries, I should be grateful.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): As to the Law Society expenses, it was not possible for us to provide any substantial additional sums towards the fund that is divided up amongst the members of the profession for claims in those cases where the profession has not been remunerated to any extent by the applicant for legal assistance but I have discussed with the society two methods of relieving the fund so that the dividend in those cases may be larger.

First, all the States are negotiating with the Commonwealth to obtain Commonwealth assistance towards the cost of cases in the Commonwealth jurisdiction. Specifically, one of the biggest calls upon the fund is in matrimonial cases and strong representations have been made by the States to the Commonwealth that it should come to the party in regard to the States' legal assistance schemes in cases where Commonwealth jurisdiction is involved. A case will be submitted to the Commonwealth Attorney-General at the next meeting of the standing committee of Attorneys-General on this score.

At the moment Victoria is preparing a detailed submission for all the States, following discussions that have been held with the Commonwealth Attorney-General. The second

method of relief we may use is the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act, which at the moment provides that the court may assign briefs in criminal cases. There are two difficulties at the moment; one is the difficulty in procedure provided by the Act that there are only certain stages at which the briefs may be assigned, and the other is that the court previously has assigned rather niggardly sums. With the increase in court fees, there should be a sufficient return to the court so that it is able to provide something more generous in the way of assistance. That would relieve the Law Society's fund and the Government of another substantial burden. I hope in this way that the burden on the profession may be lessened. The amount provided for the society for increased administration costs is exactly what it asked for.

The amounts of fidelity bonds are paid into revenue and are provided for repayments to claimants against the fidelity bonds. The provision here may be insufficient; as there have been some unpleasant cases in the last few months, the sum involved may increase considerably. Unfortunately, there have been serious defalcations. This amount is lodged with insurance companies and when it is claimed upon it is paid into general revenue. The payments out are authorized by the Attorney-General's Department, so the line has to appear here.

A contract was signed with the Law Book Company about a fortnight ago for a complete consolidation of the South Australian Statutes. It is expected that the consolidation will be in 10 volumes, although it may run to 11. These will be printed by the Government Printer, and the Law Book Company and the Government will each get a certain number of free sets. Thereafter, the returns from sales will be split between the company and the Government. It is expected that the volumes will appear over a period of some years. It will be appreciated that this is a mammoth task. The provision of £3,000 is for preliminary work on the first volume, and I hope that one or two volumes will appear each year until the consolidation is completed. So long has elapsed since the last consolidation that something of this kind is needed, as it has become quite a task for lawyers, members of the public and members of this House to find out exactly what the position is in any Statute. Other States have overhauled us, and it is time we caught up.

Mr. HUDSON: The sum of £3,946 is provided for a subsidy to the Kate Cocks Memorial Babies Home. As far as I can see, this appears

to be an entirely new item. I could not find it under "Chief Secretary". Can the Minister say whether that is correct? If it is correct, can he explain the details of it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Each of these grants under "Children's Institutions Subsidies" is a subsidy towards capital costs, and so in each case where an item appears here it is not recurrent: it is for a specific proposal by the institution concerned. For instance, "Lentara" is getting £262, which is a final payment for a previously approved project. In each of the other three cases, they are pound-for-pound subsidies for building extensions approved this year.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MINISTER OF ROADS.

Minister of Local Government and Roads Department, £11,034—passed.

Highways and Local Government Department, £1,044,770.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like to see the item relating to the collection of the road maintenance tax separated from the department's road-making activities. The only mention of this item is "Collector of Road Charges", who is housed in a separate building away from the main department. Can the Minister say what is involved in the collection of the road maintenance tax? What is the total amount involved in that line, how many people are employed in this task, and what has been the result? If the Minister cannot answer those questions, will he consider, when preparing next year's Estimates, having a separate accounting for this item?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I regret I cannot give separate figures for this item, but I will draw my colleague's attention to the Leader's suggestion and get the information required.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £160,597.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I understand that the present chairman of the Local Government Act Revision Committee has been appointed to other duties. Can the Minister say whether another chairman has been appointed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am not aware of any other appointment having been made yet, but I shall try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for £89,690,403 was

founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Honourable Frank Walsh, and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is for the appropriation of £89,690,403, details of which are set out in the Estimates which have just been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of £61,690,403, being the difference between the amount authorized by the two Supply Acts (£28,000,000) and the total of the appropriation required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the allocation of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. The clause also provides that, if increases of salaries or wages become payable pursuant to any determination made by a properly constituted authority, the Governor may appropriate the necessary funds by warrant, and the sum available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased accordingly. The clause further provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, from bores in the Adelaide Water District, and through the Morgan-Whyalla water main should be greater than the sums set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the funds for the additional expenditure, and the sum available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time up to the sums set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor, and provides that the receipts obtained from the payee shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the uses of Loan Funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1965, or at a rate in excess of the rate which was in force under any determination during the period in respect of which the payment is made; that is to say, it gives authority to make retrospective payments. Clause 7 provides that sums appropriated by the Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated.

In commending this Bill for the consideration of honourable members may I thank them for the speeches they have made. I hope that they have received a reasonable amount of information concerning the matters that

required the introduction of this Bill. I sincerely hope that this Bill, the first large Appropriation Bill I have introduced, will meet with the approval of the House, and I commend it to honourable members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill follows closely similar Bills that have been introduced over a number of years, and its main provisions do not cause me much concern. One or two provisions have been necessary for meeting contingencies, for instance, in connection with the pumping of water. Obviously the amount set down in the Estimates at this stage for this purpose is purely and simply an estimate which could be very wide of the mark, because, if the season sets in and continues dry and hot, undoubtedly the amount provided will not be sufficient. Therefore, it is necessary for the Treasurer to have additional accommodation. Nor do I have any problem with the clause that sets out that all the lawful determinations which are not at present in force can be met by the Treasurer.

However, there is one technical matter to which I wish to draw the Treasurer's attention. It is a matter on which I have a considerable problem. I raise the question of service pay not as any criticism, but I am rather concerned about the statements made regarding the authority to make the payments. At the time service pay was introduced the Treasurer said that it was not necessary to have the additional authorities set out to make the payment, that the payment could be made merely by the vote provided on the Supplementary Estimates. However, he had a somewhat different view when he introduced the Financial Statement, for he then said:

Provision is made in the Estimates for the payment of the 1½ per cent increase in margins which, following the decision of the Arbitration Commission, is being extended through most awards and agreements. Because at the time of preparation of the Budget details by no means all sections of Government employment had been covered by these particular increases, the appropriation is shown as a separate line for each department. The provision in the Estimates will not in itself constitute an authority or decision to pay the increase, but it will constitute a provision to meet the additional costs if and when they are awarded or determined by the appropriate authorities. The aggregate of provisions made in the Estimates for these purposes is about £685,000.

That seems to me to be a complete contradiction of the statement made when the Supplementary Estimates were introduced, and if the statement made then was correct I cannot see the purpose of the provision in clause 6 of

this Bill, which states:

The Treasurer may—

(a) out of the money appropriated by this Act and included in the estimates of expenditure of the Government of South Australia, passed by the House of Assembly for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six; or

(b) out of any money which may be appropriated pursuant to subsection (2) of section 3 of this Act,

make any payment notwithstanding that the payment is—

(i) in respect of a period to the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five; or

The Treasurer dealt with that in his explanation, and I accept it, but placita (ii) causes me difficulty. It reads:

at a rate in excess of the rate which, during the period in respect of which the payment is made, was in force under any return made under the Acts relating to the public service, or pursuant to any regulation or any award, order or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix salaries or wages.

I cannot see the need for this additional authority. I cannot see how there can be a reference to a rate in excess of a rate. If there is authority to pay all the sums awarded, and if, as was stated on the Supplementary Estimates, there is power to pay an excess amount, why do we have to include in this Bill an enabling power to pay an excess amount?

Mr. Jennings: You know!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe I know. I believe that the previous statement that the Government can pay in excess is not strictly accurate. I should like to have a detailed explanation of the latter part of clause 6. The Treasurer's second reading explanation does not cover the point. There is authority to make retrospective payments, but why is there authority to make payments in excess of award rates? That has nothing to do with retrospectivity. Will the Treasurer get a report as to why this provision is inserted? He has already claimed that the necessary authorities are available to him to make the payments.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to obtain the information, but I remind the Leader that there could be some outstanding excesses of salaries and service pay that may have to be considered. I will get a full report for the Leader.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 6, at 2 p.m.